Exhibit 13

(Exhibit 13 is a video of Policy Ideas to Fix America's Universities filed and served separately)

Exhibit 13a

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	POLICY IDEAS TO FIX AMERICA'S UNIVERSITIES
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1 (Recording begins.) 2 MR. ATLAS: Policy Ideas to Fix America's 3 Universities is going to start here moderated. An honor to introduce Todd Zywicki, who many people probably know, a George Mason University professor of law at the Antonin Scalia Law 6 School and a personal leader in the fight against insanity of COVID. And Todd will moderate a stellar panel. 7 8 MR. ZYWICKI: All right. We're batting cleanup here, so we'll -- we'll keep everybody awake, although 10 that was a tough act to follow. So I guess I'm here because --11 so I've done -- I -- I can see this issue from a couple 12 perspectives. Back about 15 years ago, I was elected as an 13 insurgent write-in candidate to the Dartmouth College Board of Trustees. Peter Robinson was -- got elected along with me, 15 a -- a Hoover fellow. And I managed to be an -- sub- -- enough 16 of a nuisance to get kicked off by the other trustees after one 17 term. 18 I can also claim credit -- I think I'm the only 19 person I know of who is responsible, at least partially, for 20 getting speech codes repealed at two different universities, 21 both at Dartmouth and at George Mason. And took me five years 22 at George Mason. 23 And Ms. Scott eluded more -- and as Sarah 24 mentioned earlier, I sued my -- my employer, my university, over their COVID vaccination mandate based on natural immunity,

and Jay graciously -- and was one of my expert witnesses in -- in the case. And so soon as they saw his affidavit, they folded immediately.

But -- so I've seen this from inside the board room, I've seen this as a faculty member, I've seen this -- and so -- so I'm going to give you some general impressions about all this and set the table for our amazing panel, who are doing some really interesting things and have some great examples of tools that could be -- could be used.

And I'm going to start off with a couple of premises, which is the first thing is, I'm going to say, I don't know what our strategy is for reversing ideological dominance at universities, but whatever it is, it's not working. Is there anybody here who thinks that whatever our strategy is is working? Yeah, that's what I thought.

So we could keep doing the same thing and it's still going to not work. So I think the premise of this panel is, let's think about what might work. Now, nothing I'm going to say am I going to guarantee is going to make it work, right? What I will say, though, is the trajectory is clear, if we do nothing, we know where this ends, right?

Aaron tried to give us some optimistic views earlier. He's more optimistic than I am. I think this just ends in a -- another Dark Ages if -- if we don't do anything. So -- so, you know, what it seems to be is we try to tell the

1

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

```
1
   left they should appreciate intellectual diversity, they should
   appreciate idealogical diversity. My, aren't you hypocrites,
   what you -- what you -- what -- what you do, right? I mean,
   there's -- there's room for that, but -- but it's not working,
   right? So I'm going to start with that -- that -- that
6
   premise, right?
7
                  The second premise, I think is pretty well
   established. Jay eluded to this earlier, is the left believes
   in power and the left responds to power. The left does not
   respond to being told they're hypocrites or they're
10
11
   intellectually dishonest. They respond to power. Now, why do
12
   I know that? Because they say that. It's not like they're
13
   hiding the ball here. The left is -- view of the world is the
   world is -- is power, right?
15
                  And this is the framework which I say is going
   all the way back to Marcuse, though. Why do they oppose free
16
17
   speech on campus? Because as Marcuse explained, free speech is
18
   another -- just another vehicle for the dominant class to
19
   reassert their authority over -- over the subordinate, the
20
   subordinate people, right?
21
                  Their view is the purpose of the univer- --
22
   if -- if -- if they bou- -- the -- the idea that the university
23
   exists to pursue truth, if you buy that premise, everything
24
   else is a rounding error, right? Free speech, intellectual
   diversity, standards of proof, all that sort of stuff, that's a
```

1 trivial deduction.

They don't believe the university exists for truth, because they don't believe there's truth, number one.

They believe the university is perhaps the most important institution in society to promote liberation, to right the power imbalances of all the systemic racism and everything else that -- that we -- that we heard, right?

So they are fundamentally playing by different rules. We are playing the game we inherited from the Middle Ages in universities, which we could call it the shared search for truth game, right? The universities are about a shared search for truth, dialogue, open speech, everybody is trying to sort of understand the truth. That's not their view.

Their view is, they're playing the dominance hierarchy game. They're playing the dominance game. You're either up or you're down. And any arguments that advance the prevailing dominance hierarchy are illegitimate, any arguments against it are legitimate, right? So what does that mean? Anything goes. When they say speech is violence, that is not just a rhetorical expression, right? We need to start actually paying attention to what they say.

They are telling us -- they are telling us what they mean. They believe speech is violence because it reaffirms the existing power dominance in -- in society. So we could continue to play the reciprocal free speech game, the,

1 you know, the reciprocal search for truth game while they are playing the power dominance game, and I think we see how this -- how thi- -- how this plays out, right? These are not decent people. These are not good 5 people. Right? These are people who will fire you, who will 6 end your career because you have a mis- -- a bad -- a bad 7 Tweet, right? These are people who will stick vaccines and booster shots in 19-year-old boys, right? 9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.) 10 MR. ZYWICKI: For whatever reason, right? 11 are not good people, right? And we need to, I think, 12 appreciate that, the kind of people we're dealing with on --13 on -- on campus, right? Now, one of the implications of this is, it is -- ironically, it is truth, not error, that they want 15 to suppress. It is truth not error. Why? Error can be 16 rebutted by argument, but truths that can be in their terms, 17 quote, weaponized, unquote, to reaffirm the existing power 18 hierarchy, that's what must be suppressed, the things we heard 19 about earlier, right? 20 Any research, the hypothesis, asking the 21 questions that could provide insights that could be true, but 22 then could be, in their view, used to reaffirm existing power 23 dominance is what must be suppressed. Truth must not only be 24 ignored and must actually be suppressed if it reasserts the existing powerarchy.

1 So I know we have a lot of economists in this 2 I would wager Roland Fryer's study on police shootings could not be published in the AAR today in the form that it wa- -- in the form it was published in 2019, right? The world has fundamentally changed in that way. Why? Because it is --6 could be true. I'm not even saying it's true, but it could be 7 true, which is precisely why it has to -- to -- that's happened, right? 9 So what does this mean? This means if they are 10 playing a power game and we're not, this is just tit for tat, 11 right? This is just tit for tat. You don't have to be an 12 economist to understand enough game theory to understand tit 13 for tat, that if you don't fight back, they're going to just continue to pummel you, right? And so whether you like it or 15 not, we have to be -- if -- we can either lose or we have to be 16 willing to use power to fight power, as I think as Jay was --17 was saying earlier, right? 18 Now, I recognize everything I'm saying can have 19 unintended consequences. Right? Everything I'm saying can 20 have unintended consequence. Tit for tat can lead to a stable equilibrium, where we get back to some degree of neutrality and 21 standards. Tit for tat can also lead to the Hatfields and 22 23 McCoys, right? Now, why do I think not withstanding the 24 unintended consequences? I think it's worth thinking about it. Because where -- the -- the worst case scenarios, we end up

1 where we're going, just faster. Right? I think, again, if we don't do anything, we end up in -- in the gutter, right? 3 Another argument people say is, Well, you know, what happens if Elizabeth Warren gets ahold of this, right, some of the things I'm talking about. Come on, folks. Elizabeth Warren isn't waiting around for us to pass laws that 7 says it's okay to -- to do these things, right? They are not playing by any established rules. They are not constrained by the rules, and so maybe -- maybe they might be a little more, 10 you know, worse than they are now, right, but I'm -- I mean, 11 it's -- let's -- let's be realistic, right? We're the only 12 ones who are concerned about the rules, and so if we -- you 13 know, let's -- let's be -- let's be aware of that. All right? 14 Now, let me just say about a minute or so on 15 unintended consequences I do worry about, and then talk about a 16 few ideas and then turn it over to the panel. Which is first 17 is, we do need to be concerned about unintended consequences. 18 And in particular, we actually need to to think through the 19 incentives we are creating. So let me give you two examples. 20 The first is, one of the problems at the 21 university today goes back, I think, in con- -- previous 22 conservative efforts to reform the university, it goes back, of 23 all things, to William F. Buckley and God and Man at Yale. 24 What Buckley said was what we need to do is get some hardheaded CEOs on those board of trustees and they'll ride herd on those

1 lazy faculty members and that sort of thing, right? 2 Well, I served on the Dartmouth board with a 3 bunch of hardheaded trustees, and it didn't quite work out that way, right? Basically, their view was, the president in the university is a CEO like me, so I'll just let the president in the university run the -- run the university like I want people 7 to allow me to be the -- the -- the CEO, right? What does that end up doing? 9 Well, in a world without profit and loss 10 statements, you basically -- what you get now, which is 11 basically, in a nonprofit, you get bureaucratic empire 12 building, right, by the -- by the president; and you get a 13 bunch of academics running rings around the board of trustees. We actually had a discussion when I was on the Dartmouth board, 15 one of these board members, who is a really tough guy, really 16 smart, tough guy, actually had the temerity to ask about grade 17 inflation. 18 And the dean at the time, the dean of -- of the 19 faculty, just ran rings around him. You got this, you got 20 that, there's all these different reasons. And so, basically, 21 he just -- he basically said, You're an idiot and I can't 22 believe you ask such idiot questions, right? And that was the 23 end of it, right? We never revisited the question of grade 24 inflation or a lot of other things like that. 25 The second thing I think we should be very

1 careful about, and you can dismiss me as pleading in self-interest here, but getting rid of tenure, I think, would be a very bad idea. And the reason is, the reality is simply, yes, I've talked about unintended consequences, yes, I've talked about tit for tat, the reality is the left is just more ruthless. And they're going to fire us -- they're going to 7 fire us before we fire any of them. So, you know, and -- and I don't think we should be as ruthless as they are, right? 9 But in thinking through these sorts of things, we should be realistic about who they are and who we are, and I 10 don't think we should be that person, right? And I think 11 12 everybody in this room has to ask, what is our limit, right? What is our limit in terms of what we're going to do? I mean, 13 it's clear, the left -- the left obviously discriminates on 15 ideology when they do hiring, right? 16 Could I bring myself to actually discriminate on 17 the basis of ideology? I don't know. Right? Could I 18 basically say, I'm going to weigh somebody's ideology over 19 their competence? That would be a tough thing for me to decide 20 to do, right? Whatever -- whatever the case may be. It's easy It's hard for -- it's -- it's harder for me. And I 21 think it's harder for a lot of us to -- to do that, which may 22 23 just mean, you know, we've got limits that they -- that they 24 don't have, right? 25 So let me say what might work then. I said what

1 I don't think will work. First is savvy use of government power. A good example of this is the Solomon Amendment, if you're familiar with this. This is the federal law that requires universities that receive federal funding to allow the military to recruit on campus. 6 Bunch of law schools challenged this a few years 7 ago, saying it was a violation of the First Amendment rights. Bunch of us at Scalia law school filed the brief in support of the Solomon Amendment as a legitimate use of government power. But -- but it works. Why does it work? Because universities 10 11 know that -- that the government is serious about it. 12 university knows that the gov- -- that the government will, in fact, enforce the Solomon Amendment. And universities complain 13 14 about it, but they go along with it, right? 15 So the idea of using something like the Solomon 16 Amendment for free speech for things like that, that basically 17 say, in some way, your funding is going to be tied to a certain 18 standard, certain things that you do, right, could be something we could look at. Could it have unintended consequences, could 19 20 the left weaponize us -- against us? In theory, yes. 21 practice, they're doing it already. How much worse can it get, 22 right, to use this? 23 Related to that, I think, is the idea of 24 potentially a free speech ombudsman that some people have -have talked about. Which is, in state governments, for

1 example, requiring free speech ombudsmen, somebody who would have to report every year on the condition of free speech, or basically somebody that students could complain to if they felt like they had a free speech -- a claim. Could it be used by the left? Sure. You know, what's -- you know, what's the difference? Basically, they're -- you know, they're doing that 7 already, just through the -- through the dean's -- through the dean's office, right? And I think we'll hear more in Florida about some of the things that Florida is doing, and so I won't 10 steal the thunder from my -- my pan- -- my co-panelist on some 11 of the things they're doing with that. 12 I think a third thing that we should focus on 13 that was eluded to earlier is, we need to develop a farm team of administrators. When I was on the Dartmouth board, I 14 15 potentially had the opportunity to basically recommend any 16 qualified candidate in America to potentially be the -- the 17 president of Dartmouth. All right? 18 Turns out, there were essentially zero 19 conservative or even moderately con- -- mildly conservative 20 candidates who would be capable of being the -- a -- a finalist 21 for the presidency of a place like Dartmouth, right? 22 Presidents in, say, a Big Ten school or Provost, another Ivy 23 League school or something like that, right, we just don't have 24 a farm team. And these administrators do and these presidents have a lot of power. It was -- as was the case earlier.

1 Ben Sasse at Florida's kind of a sui generis 2 type appointment, but he's going to have obvious limitations 3 because he's not an academic and that sort of thing. And so trying to figure out how we groom a farm team of administrators, I think, is -- I think is important. 6 We also heard earlier, I think we have to be 7 willing to use the tools we have. And so Aaron and I were talking about this. You know, using litigation, right? The courtroom may be the -- about the only place nowadays you can get a fair hearing. Title IX cases have almost universally 11 won. When people challenge the kangaroo courts in Title IX 12 cases on campuses, they -- they almost universally prevail, 13 because these things are such awful star chambers, right? And universities usually just won't change unless they are -- they 15 are sued, right? 16 And -- and you -- and -- and so you've got to be 17 willing to -- to use the tools that -- that you have, right? 18 EOC complaints, for example, I think is something that's worth thinking about, right, to challenge some of these other sorts 20 of things. One of the things that's important about this is, why -- why do I say this? Why is it important to use these 21 22 tools? Well, here's -- here's the thing, which is the left 23 knows -- like, so why do we still have speech codes on 24 campuses? I mean, we've been arguing for 25 years. You know, some day this could be turned against you, you know? Some day,

10

14

1 the Israeli students could turn this against the Palestinian 2 students, right? 3 And it's hard to say it with a straight face, right? Because everybody knows that's never going to happen, right? The only reason we have speech codes is because they know they'll always be implemented in a one way -- way in --7 in -- in practice, right, not in theory. And so I think certain things -- this is sort of using power for -- power with power. 10 I'll just give you an example that's going on 11 right now, is over a dozen federal judges have announced that they're going to boycott Yale law school for hiring their 12 13 clerks, right? All of a sudden, Yale's dean announced, here's our free speech policies, right? And what's the point? You 15 say, Well, that's not very nice to punish the conservative 16 students. It's like, well, if you believe free speech matters, 17 what el- -- what's your strategy, smart guy? Right? If you're 18 a judge who believes this is important, what's your strategy 19 for -- for dealing with it, right? 20 I'll say just a couple more things. 21 it's important to stop trying to compromise, stop trying to 22 rationalize with these people. Stop trying to negotiate with 23 them. I've seen this a lot, especially with these centers on 24 campus. I think Don [sic] Bonevac said it very well earlier today. Pol- -- apologize if I misspoke your word, right?

1 Which is, it only gets worse. Wherever you start from, it goes downhill from there, right? So if you compromise to begin with, you're already halfway gone, right? If you've got the -- we've heard this again and 5 again. If you've got the moral high ground, assert the moral high ground, right? Don't -- don't surrender it. 7 I'll tell you this, my -- my story was when I -- when I settled my lawsuit, one of the reporters -- so one of the things that they did with George Mason was, they didn't just recognize as 10 the vaccine mandate anything approved by the FDA. They had any 11 vaccine approved by the World Health Organization. 12 And when I first saw that -- because I was 13 expecting this to be the FDA. And I saw it and I was on 14 vacation, and I burst out laughing and my wife is, like, What's 15 so funny? And I said George Mason just said the Sinovac vaccine is okay, but natural immunity isn't. 16 17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Right. 18 MR. ZYWICKI: Right? And I said, and I'm going 19 to take Sinovac and I'm going to shove it up George Mason's you 20 know what every single time I'm on television, right? And so a 21 reporter asked, Why did George Mason settle? I said, I don't 22 know. Maybe they just didn't want to hear about Sinovac every 23 day for the next year, right? 24 But basically, what's the point? The point is, you -- that you have to be accurate, but you don't have to be

1 fair, right? I didn't have to beat Pfizer and Moderna at the time, I had to beat Sinovac, right? So make them defend Sinovac, right? The policy at George Mason was designed by the fire chief of the university, right? My position was defended by Jay Bhattacharya. Right? I went on TV and said, The fire chief says I have to get the vaccine. Jay Bhattacharya and 7 Martin Kulldorff say I don't, right? 8 You know, basically, the point is, make them defend the indefensible. Push them out to their fences, push 10 it beyond it, stay on the offensive, make them defend their --11 their principle, right? And one of the lessons of this is 12 basically Saul Alinsky. If people haven't read Saul Alinsky, 13 read Saul Alinsky. That panel we just heard was an hour of classic Saul Alinsky. Ridicule, push them beyond their --15 their perimeters, have fun, never let up. 16 The last thing I'll say is, name the premise. 17 And I'll close on this and I've already gone too long. Name 18 the premise. Make them say it, pin them down in detail. So, 19 for example, here's the question every president -- every 20 college president who wants to have the booster mandate should 21 be asked by students and parents. Tell me your number, Mr. and 22 Mrs. President. How many young men on this campus is the right 23 number for cases of myocarditis to get this booster? Five, 24 twelve, ten? Tell me your number. How many -- what is the acceptable collateral damage for you to do this? Give me a

1 Right? Pin them down in detail. Make them -- don't allow them to talk around it. Make them name the premise, make them name it with -- with specificity. When we were -- we got tangled up in a dean 5 search at George Mason and got commandeered by the DIE [sic] And here's what I did, was, I said, Okay, you told us 7 we need to have a -- a diverse slate. Tell me what diversity is, exactly. If we give you a black lesbian, does that count? Is that enough? Right? Exactly. Tell me exactly what you 10 want, right? Why -- what was the deal? 11 Basically, the deal was, they wanted to --12 basically, their premise is, everybody knows how this works. 13 We all break the law and we pretend like we're not, right? And I basically said, I'm not playing that game, right? I'm not 15 playing that game. If you want to break the law, you have to 16 break the law. And I'm going to put it in my notes and it's 17 going to be foible, right? And, you know, of course, I 18 couldn't get an answer out of them, but it made them very 19 uncomfortable, right? 20 What was it? Make them name it. Make them name 21 it. Don't let them get away with their slickness in getting --22 getting around it. Make them defend the indefensible. With 23 that, I will turn it over to my -- to my colleagues. Thank 24 you. 25 MR. LOWERY: So I guess I'll -- I'll start off

and, you know, problem anytime I talk with Todd is we're too highly correlated, so I'll just try not to overlap too much.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Microphone.

MR. LOWERY: Yeah. So my contribution here, I think Professor Hankins mentioned that he viewed himself as possibly the world's greatest expert on the Renaissance, roughly, I think. And that seemed like a fair statement. I might very well be the world's greatest expert on failed academic reform, so I will try to bring that perspective to bear.

Briefly, the -- the picture is we have -- we have to do this because we've basically replaced our leaders from people who could potentially use logic and evidence with people who think that's inappropriate. And at the same time, they reject the natural crutch of tradition and just doing the same old stuff. So we've got people who will neither reason nor appeal the tradition, and that's creating a leadership class that's just a complete failure.

So how do we fix that? And I think that has to come from higher education, because that's where -- we've moved -- that's what we've done. We've moved away from having -- educating people in those ways. So going into details, what are the things we need to do? And I think big picture, three big things that need to happen, and I'll go through the three big things that need to happen and then the

three reasons they won't happen.

1

10

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So, yeah. We should have left with the students 3 because that would have -- you could have all left with false So the first thing we have to do is complete and total legal and legislative removal of all the DEI, CRT, queer theory stuff from all positions of administrative power in universities. As long as they are there, we can't do anything. The -- and they are in -- you know, such a -- what -- what others might call an idealogical purge is necessary because those ideas are fundamentally incompatible with the idea of 11 free inquiry or the functioning of a university.

So that is -- that has to happen and it's difficult, but we have to, you know, stop trying to be nice to people and get it done. And that means remove the ideas and remove the people. Because this whack-a-mole thing where, Oh, they went too far and they put in too strong of a DEI requirement, we'll make them take it back, that doesn't work if you just leave the person in place and they come back and they do it, you know, next Tuesday after you stop paying attention. So that has to be complete.

We also have to remove that same set of ideas and the same set of personnel from anything involves a -- a required curriculum for graduation at, at least, a public university. So again, this will sound like I'm saying we need to purge, but we cannot have a situation where, in order to get

a degree conferred on you by, for example, the State of Texas, you have to sit through idealogical training. That is not an active academic freedom, that's suppression of academic freedom, so we need that complete purge.

And I think Professor Bonevac mentioned our flags, and that's when -- you know, we have explicit, you have to sit through at least one critical race theory class in order to graduate from the University of Texas. So to get a degree conferred by the State, you have to sit through political training. And we cannot tolerate that, and as long as that's there, we're going to continue to mint the same sort of students that we've been minting, who go and join the government and impose this stuff on everyone else.

The third thing we have to do, and this is a little more creative perhaps, we have to create independent institutions, not just outside, but within the universities. It's great, the idea to build -- you know, we could rebuild history outside of the universities. There are donors who will do that. That's a good thing. We also have to be able to confer degrees on people without them having to go through the insanity they're going through.

So we need to create independent colleges and schools within universities that have the -- the authority to allow students to satisfy all the de- -- all the requirements for graduation without going to the insane people. And that's

absolutely essential and that -- as soon as you start getting any progress on that, that's where they come after you, for sure. That's personal experience.

So why is none of this going to work? None of this is going to work because there's no constituency for real reform amongst conservatives. You know, we can hear the optimism from our Saul Alinsky style young conservatives, but they're not the ones running state legislatures, they're not the ones running family fortunes, and the people who are like that are old school conservatives who have excessive respect for institutions and hierarchies. And they will never side with reformers or insurgents against established hierarchies and institutions. They will just defer to the prestigious institution, even if it's run specifically by a critical race theorist who would throw them in jail for their business activities and their speech. They will stand with the institution against anyone who challenges an institution or a hierarchy. The conservative sensibility is incompatible with what is needed to return a conservative voice to campus or society as a whole.

The other reason none of this will ever happen is because academic freedom is such a gravely misunderstood concept amongst, again, conservatives in power. They treat academic freedom as a requirement for noninterference, when noninterference is what destroys academic freedom. If you sit

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1 by and let unelected bureaucrats determine the curriculum, and the -- what acceptable ideas can take place at a state university, you are betraying academic freedom, you are not practicing it. But they cannot understand this and they will not act because they're petrified of ever possibly treading on anyone's academic freedom.

And the third reason this will all fail is because even within conservative academics, you know, maybe a tiny fraction, five percent of academics are conservative, within that group, 90 percent are accommodating grifters, for lack of a better word. There will always be someone to step up and say, Oh, no, this person's crazy, they go too far. And I'm happy to take the large salary to run the institute in the way that keeps, you know -- we -- we could keep the donors happy, and we don't actually have to challenge the power of the left.

And conservatives, again, they love these people because these people tell them optimistic stories. people go to the football game with the president, these people are very good at one thing and one thing only, which is convincing people that everything's actually not that bad, and as long as I get enough resources, we'll do it. And every single time, I have looked at so many of these attempts and I've been involved with them, the grifter always wins. And the grifter always wins not because of the university, but because of the donors, the alumni and the politicians. They'd always

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1 rather go with the grifter. And so that's why we're doomed. 2 And yeah. 3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible) after that? 4 MR. LOWERY: So I will say, if you want a moment of optimism, Todd mentioned the potential for a dark age, but, you know, in the old dark age, it took a really long time for the information that was lost to get back. Maybe with the internet, we can have a V-shaped dark age. Maybe it'll only be a few decades, but that's the best I can see. 10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Back to the monastery. 11 MR. LOWERY: Yeah. Exact- -- I mean, that's -maybe that's our only job. Maybe that's what Hillsdale is 12 13 going to be, is we'll just hold on for a few more years until everything gets really bad and maybe something can be rebuilt, 15 but I'm not optimistic. So thanks. 16 Thank you, Todd. I -- I have to say MR. EITEL: 17 that having seen our young friends from the universities, I 18 actually am optimistic because that's our future right there, 19 and they're the ones that are going to make it happen. So I 20 got to disagree with you on that. My name's Bob Eitel. I lead a group called the 21 22 Defensive Freedom Institute for Policy Studies, which is a 23 conservative Libertarian group focused on federal education and 24 workforce policy and related civil rights issues. So for purposes of this conversation, I'm going to focus on federal

policy solutions, and there are some federal policy solutions.

The reason we have such a focus at DFI about federal policy is because I and my cofounder were on Secretary DeVos's leadership team at the U.S. Department of Education for four years, where we worked on regulatory reform, including Title IX. I was an architect of the rule that was published in 2020. And so our focus is on the role of the U.S. Department of Education, if any, in connection with some of these reforms.

I should probably state that probably every--probably everyone in this room takes the view that the U.S.

Department of Education should be abolished. And I concur with that. We also probably all have the view that federal executive power and its role in the American education system, including -- including higher ed should be, at most, minimal. The difficulty is, is that I don't know the department and the federal rule are going anywhere. I think that they're here to stay. They may be reduced somewhat in a conservative future -- a future conservative administration and Congress, but I don't see the Title IV program going anywhere, as much as I'd like to see it abolished or Pell Grants or any of that.

So the question then becomes, what can conservatives do in this area to deal with the issues that we've heard today? So let me give -- let me give you some ideas. The first thing that Congress should do is to take steps to nurture intellectual diversity in higher ed. And the

1 way to do that is not to create some office in some federal agency that polices these issues, but to simply pass a viewpoint discrimination act that effects post-secondary institutions that participate in the Title IV program or otherwise receive federal financial assistance and prohibits 6 viewpoint discrimination in university employment decisions and 7 in educational programs and activities. 8 That is an elegant way of doing it, it puts the issue in the courts. I would not create an office in the 10 justice department or the education department to police the 11 issue, much like we have with Title IX or Title VI or an EEOC. 12 It would be a -- a -- a statute that a plaintiff would be able to sue under to seek monetary relie- -- monetary damages, 13 injunctive relief, declaratory relief, and most importantly, 15 their attorney's fees and costs if they are the prevailing 16 plaintiff. 17 That will cause, I think, our friends on the left to think twice about cancel culture or treating many of 18 19 these academics the way they've been treated by their 20 colleagues where they've been fired or their conditions of

You would have to have exemptions for military schools and service academies, because it's a different educational environment, as well as for religious schools, because there are special, I think, religious institutional

employment have been limited in a negative way.

21

22

23

missions in play there that aren't a factor at a Stanford or a George Mason.

The second thing that needs to happen is that

Congress needs to sta- -- take steps to curve the power of the

Title IX offices and the DEI offices on campus. So for

instance, Congress needs to dive into Title IX as a statute and

do -- make some amendments. And those amendments need to do

the following things.

They need to clarify that sex under Title IX means biological sex at birth, not gender identity. It needs to provide special protections for women's sports in spaces like dorms. It needs to mandate basic due process, protections in disciplinary proceedings. It needs to beef up exemptions under the statute for religious schools who can obtain an -- an exemption under Title IX, and it needs to codify many of the Betsy DeVos Department of Education Title IX regulations that were put into place in 2020, regarding what exactly is sexual harassment. That would -- that would limit the scope of the influence and the power and authority of these Title IX offices on campus. And I'll get to the DEI offices in a moment.

Third, federal policy should encourage the establishment in growth of new and innovative institutions of higher education. And a perfect example of that is the University of Austin. We need more Universities of Austin. We need the centers that Professor Haskins [sic] was talking about

earlier today. Those conform the nucleus of a future college and university up the road.

The difficulty here is that we have accreditation requirements under the Higher Education Act that can make this very difficult to do. So Congress needs to amend the HEA, and there's a possibility this can happen in 2025 if you have the right president and you have a -- a truly conservative Congress, is they need to abolish the regional accreditation cartels, make these agencies act based on the mission of their schools, not their locations.

They need to accredit schools on a national basis, not on a regional basis as now exists. They need to -in the HEA, Congress needs to amend the HEA to protect the sovereignty of states to decide the leadership and governance issues for their state university systems. We see this issue going on in California, and I have a feeling we'll be hearing about that issue later.

The HEA accreditation rules need to be beefed up to protect religious schools or schools controlled by religious organizations so that accreditation agencies honor the institutional mission of religious or faith-based institutions. And we need to prohibit accreditation agencies from leveraging their Title IV student loan gatekeeper role to mandate that post-secondary educational institutions not adopt diversity, equity and inclusion policies.

One of the reasons our universities and colleges are pushing these DEI policies in offices is because they -- they take the position that the accreditors require it. And they -- and if they're not -- and if the school is not accredited, they can't get -- they can't participate in Title IV and get student loans.

This is not directly on point, but I have to say it because this is a big hobbyhorse of mine, and that is the -- my final point and that is this. Congress needs to take steps to combat the influence of foreign governments and their proxies in higher ed, and I'm particularly thinking of China and the Chinese Communist Party.

We have a disclosure requirement under the Higher Education Act that's very weak. If you don't oblige, then the worst you're going to get is a nasty letter from the Department of Education and maybe -- maybe the Justice Department. They need to beef up that provision, and they need to -- to ensure that those disclosure provisions, wherein an institution has to disclose their contributions, their gifts and contracts with for- -- foreign governments and their proxies, they need to disclose that fully and completely and make it -- and this is the -- the change, make it con- -- a -- a -- a contingency for Title IV funding. That is, if you don't do it, you lose your participation in the program.

That's the only way these colleges and

1 universities are going to pay attention to this issue. It's all on there. I know we're limited in time. 3 MR. CORCORAN: Thank you. My name's Richard Corcoran. I apologize. I've gotten a sore throat. It's not 5 COVID or strep, I assure you. I even thought of calling Scott and saying, Hey, I might have to cancel, I'm losing my voice. 7 But then I thought, I'm from Florida, we don't cancel anything, so I had to show. 9 But I -- I have three things that I would share 10 too. First, and before I get started, I do want to thank --11 you guys probably read, we were probably one of the most 12 forefront states of the 50 to absolutely ensure that any child in the state of Florida at the height of COVID was offered a 13 14 seat in a school with face-to-face instruction more than any 15 other state. And we were able to do that. 16 We were immediately sued when we announced that 17 emergency order, and the way we got through that litigation 18 against the teachers union, of course, was we reached out to 19 Dr. Atlas and Dr. Atlas, at the time, was doing a lot of work 20 with the Trump Administration. He said, You need to reach out 21 to Dr. Bhattacharya. And we reached out to Jay and he was our 22 expert witness and did a phenomenal job, and we were able to 23 withstand the legal action. 24 In fact -- and then after that, the governor had asked me, Hey, I need you to go on and start selling the story

1 a little bit. And all I did was read, verbatim, like, nine times Dr. Bhattacharya's brief before the Court. And I remember being on all the CNN shows and -- and they would give their rhetoric of completely unfactual things. And I would 5 say, Well, we've, you know, got Dr. Bhattacharya from Stanford 6 and this is the facts. But a heartfelt thanks to both. 7 And then Dr. Atlas came down to Florida once we opened, and we toured the entire state with Dr. Atlas, walking through folks, why it was safe for kids to go back to school. 10 So thank you very much, both of you. 11 And I'm not an academic. I'm a lawyer by trade. 12 I became speaker of the Florida house, that's how I got to 13 become friends with Governor DeSantis. He asked me to do his transition because he really didn't know the Tallahassee for 15 secretaries and chiefs and what have you. And then he asked me 16 to be the secretary of education, which I did up until about 17 May. 18 So I will tell you -- and a lot of the comments 19 that have been made, I like a lot of them, and we've done a lot 20 of them. My bottom line would be with what you said 21 originally, and that is, what we're doing is not working. And 22 I think -- so our strategy -- my strategy has been, when I talk 23 to folks, is, we have to throw the kitchen sink at the problem. 24 And there's no such thing as a bad idea. I don't care what it is, but some ideas have less impact and take longer.

1 What we're talking about is really a 20-year 2 I mean, if we did everything right today, we'd start reaping those benefits probably in 20 years. The biggest solution to higher ed has been played out in the last three and a half years, four years in Florida, and that is, leadership is 6 everything. If you have a great leader who understands what 7 their philosophy is and is willing to fight for it, you can have game-changing outcomes. 9 And so -- and I -- and then I'll talk about two 10 other things. But -- so you look at what you said in your 11 opening, you know, we have boards for all of our universities and colleges and, of course, a lot of donors, a lot of 12 13 corporate CEOs are on those boards. And they do immediately, I 14 think as a whole, fall into place with the structure of the 15 university and defer to the academics. 16 And I -- I have far less problems with them falling in with the presidents than I do the falling in with 17 18 the provosts. You know, I think they're the most liberal 19 individuals, arguably, in the country. And -- but when you 20 have a governor who has their back and says, I will not put you 21 on that board of trustees -- which they really want to do. 22 They want to be on the University of Florida Board of Trustees, 23 that's where they went to school, that's -- they want to go to

Dickman Davenport, Inc www.dickmandavenport.com

the football games, they want to sit in the president's box.

But they -- and the criteria is, one, you're going to work; and

two, here's what you're going to work at.

It's -- it's a -- we have had great success in the last four years only with corporate executives who understand that this is who the governor is, he has our back, and they actually, in many ways, usurp the authorities of those -- or -- or oversee and hold a bigger club over those presidents and those provosts.

The two -- besides having -- and that goes to everything. So we -- we've done the University of Chicago letter, we went through -- every school had to adopt it. We have 28 colleges and 12 universities. All adopted it. We've done -- we created the -- an institute -- and again, they're all good ideas and throw the sink at it, but if we -- if every state did an institute, we just did the Hamilton Institute based in University of Florida.

You know, and the whole point is to create a farm team of more conservative professors, create an environment where kids can go and get a degree without having to be subjected to the stuff of our previous panel. But that institute, with probably four or five million dollars to seed it this last year, will produ- -- you know, have a class next year of about 50 to 100 students. If we replicated that in all 50 states and we did it at mach speed, you know, and we're at 5,000 students, all of a sudden, you know, we have -- you know, if you count all colleges: private, public, community colleges

1 and universities, I mean, we have, 19 million students. mean, we're just -- it's -- it should happen and we should do it, but we've got to recognize that that's not -that's not a -- a short-term fix. 5 We've gone after -- and I think it's a great 6 idea, the accreditation agency. I actually was -- the 7 governor, being, again, if you have a game-changing leader, he says to me, he goes, Hey, I want you to apply and -- at Florida State University. I go, I'll do it. And so immediately, I 10 apply and SACS, the accreditation agency, basically said that if I do that -- if -- if they accept me, they're going to 11 12 shut down the university, because they'll no longer be accredited. 14 And it wasn't the -- I wasn't the first victim. 15 I mean, there were other ones. Then the select -- you know, 16 the search committee, which was made up not of those corporate 17 folks, but of -- of faculty and what have you, didn't let me 18 get to the final -- final three. And -- but then we 19 immediately, because of that, went back and said, Okay. For 20 all of our colleges, all of our universities, they're all 21 accredited by -- because it's regional -- SACSSOC [sic], the 22 federal government, thanks to you, probably, and -- and Betsy 23 DeVos opened it up. 24 And so we immediately passed legislation that said, Every single university, every single college, when they

1 come for reaccreditation, cannot choose their existing one. They have to choose one other. And now, you have these other accreditation agencies who want in Florida, want in that footprint, who are literally running over in private 5 conversations, SACSSOC, and -- and that competition and diversity is going to create a much fairer system in our 7 universities. 8 But the two things I'd say, I think, that move the needle as quickly as you possibly can in anything in 10 government is transparency and accountability. And you know, 11 it's the -- you know, you go into your kitchen late at night --12 and my wife probably wouldn't appreciate me saying this, but 13 you go in your kitchen, you flick on the lights, and you see the cockroaches scurry under the cabinets, you know? But --15 but --16 MR. EITEL: It's Florida. 17 MR. CORCORAN: Yeah, yeah, it's Florida. 18 But -- but they're there. The same thing in 19 transparency in education. In fact, when I was going through 20 that process, one of the faculty members came up to me -- well, 21 I met with them as part of the application process. And one of the faculty members said, You know, you're working on a bill 22 23 that you're pushing -- because I was secretary at the time --24 that says that, among other things, we're going to do diversity studies so that we can see where our faculty is, you know,

1 and -- and -- and line that up against previous years and decades. But also in that bill I said that any student who uses their cell phone in a classroom for recording purposes or video purposes is completely legal, completely authorized and completely allowed. 6 And so that was what they were upset about. And 7 he's like, You know, why would you -- you know, where are you on that bill? What are you doing? And -- and I said to him, I said, Well, what exactly is going on your in classroom that you 10 don't want us to see? You know, and -- and he goes, No, 11 I go, So I think we're -- I think we're good, you 12 know, there's no argument there. But that kind of transparency 13 is a game changer. And we need it even in the K-12. It gets much 14 15 more sensitive in the K-12 because of the ages. But if you --16 and that's really -- many silver linings of COVID. 17 of the greatest silver linings is the absolute revolution of 18 parents against education. I don't think CRT -- I think it's 19 been going on for decades. I think all of these things have 20 been going on for -- I think gender influence by teachers has 21 been going on for decades. 22 But with COVID and with cameras in classrooms 23 and with all of that available at the hands of parents, you saw 24 this outrage. And that outrage led to -- I don't think Youngkin gets elected in Virginia apart from education and the

revolt against what's going on against parental rights. Ever to the point his -- his -- his opponent said that he thought that the State had more rights over those children than the parents.

And when that happens, you see that revolt. And I think you're going to see it in a -- in a few weeks nationwide. But when you have that kind of transparency, I think we can move the needle and we can force those outcomes more so with -- with the -- with the schools.

And then accountability works. I know you guys mentioned the Solomon. But when you put a focus -- and there's a lot of ways we can do this. Also, I think -- which is a little bit more difficult and there is unintended quonces -consequences to a lot of what we say, but the accountability we have, we immediately put in -- and I -- and I would be against -- I am maybe not -- I know Betsy came out the other day and said that -- but I'm not against shutting down if -- if somebody who's a great leader becomes president of this country and he has a -- an opportunity to put into place a secretary of education who has a -- you know, 10s of billions of dollars' worth of budget to influence what's going on in these liberal states, not one school -- not -- we have 67 counties in Florida. If we did not have the power of the purse, it's our strongest weapon, without question, nothing comes close. Without that power of purse, we would not have opened up

1

5

6

7

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

schools, we have not have ended mask mandates, we would not have ended vaccine mandates, we would not have gotten rid of CRT, we would not have gotten, again [sic] of -- of gender teaching. All of that was done strictly by the power of the purse.

And the federal government's power is even greater than ours and -- and I will tell you, not -- other than Florida, I think a lot of the other 49 states needs someone to come down to them and say, If these things continue, you will not get funding. And they will react. The one thing a liberal does do is bow at the knee of -- of a lack of funding.

But that account- -- we also put in accountability that said, We're going to measure all the things that matter. You know, how many of your students are graduating in four years? How many of your freshmen become sophomores in two years? How many Pell Grant recipients do you have? What are those Pell Grant recipients doing? What -- how many kids are -- are immediate employed after school? All of those things.

And when you start putting all these pressure points that are -- that are objective onto faculty members, what happens is the leadership of that school starts pounding downward, you know, less of the opinion and the rhetoric and more of making sure that algebra's taught or -- or civics is taught, because at some point, they have to pass these exams.

1 All the other stuff we have done, we -- in 2 Florida, we have, again, 28 colleges, 12 universities. We have three million K-12 students. We only have tenure in ten universities. Everything else is tenure free. And I will say, I think we're in a great position, but liberalism abounds in our -- in our university system, even with the fact that we don't have tenure. 8 So I think there's -- there's nothing that we can't do, but in the interim, the more -- I would support 10 cameras in K-12 schools. I know it's controversial, but the 11 more that we can see what's going on, the greater -- the more 12 lights we flick on, the more the cockroaches will scramble. 13 MR. ZYWICKI: Thanks, Richard. And Reed Rubinstein, I guess was unable to participate -- he couldn't 15 make it. I'll just briefly say one -- one minute about Reed. 16 Reed was going to be on this panel. He's American First Legal. 17 He was one of the people involved in the Trump White House and 18 Department of Education behind the -- they brought a lot of 19 litigation. They also filed the -- the famous Princeton 20 letter, if you know the Princeton letter where -- where the president of Princeton came out and said, We -- we were 21 22 systemically racist here and have been for centuries. 23 And so the -- the Trump Administration asked, so 24 why, then, have you been signing every year saying you don't discriminate as a condition for getting -- for getting federal

1 I think that model, right, is very consistent with what I was saying, which is sort of the hold them to their own standard, use their own weapons against them, and don't let them sort of evade their responsibilities. I don't know if, Bob, if you have anything to add to that what Reed may have 6 been doing if worked closely with him. 7 MR. EITEL: No. I mean, that was a -- a project conceived and executed by the one-and-only Reed Rubinstein. And it -- it certainly made waves. You know, one thing we did not get into are sort of administrative moves that a -- an 10 administration could do, you know, in 2025, in terms of OCR 11 12 invest- -- officer civil rights investigations and using the 13 power of that office to go after DEI in not just higher ed, but K-12, because they're violations -- many of these programs are 15 violations -- flat-out violations of Title VI. 16 And right now, we're in a situation where 17 complaints regarding those sorts of programs are not being 18 investigated. They're -- the administration is dismissing 19 them. 20 MR. ZYWICKI: Yeah. And prior admini- -- or 21 Republican administrations on good work on religious liberties, 22 for example, by being willing to use the civil rights office to 23 really go after violations of religious liberty and they could 24 be extended here. Josh? 25 MR. RAUH: So thank -- thanks very much and --

and thanks everybody for sticking around for this. You know, solutions are a really important part of what we're trying to do here. I know, you know, Scott and I, in our Global Liberty Institute and the other institutions that are sponsoring this are really focused on solutions, so appreciate staying for the late night.

Two questions: So it seems like I heard a lot of optimism about these institutes within universities that somehow will also be able to offer courses for credit, which has been a stopping point a lot of -- lot of institutions. But my question, even if we get past the hurdles, what stops what Mr. Bonevac referred to as Conquest Rules 2 and 3 from kicking in, meaning that the organization is ultimately going to be taken over by people who go against this original mission and also that by, you know, unless they're really asserting themselves strongly as being on the right and hold that, they're going to get dragged to the left. I've just seen that happen in too many other institutions, so I'm wondering whether the optimism is, you know, can we -- can we -- can we count on that optimism?

Second question I had is about either laws or if we still have a ed department and use the power of the purse, as you say, funding, dependancy on, you know, prohibiting viewpoint discrimination. How can those regulations or laws be written so that prohibiting viewpoint discrimination will

1 really address all of the things that we've heard this entire after- -- evening that have been experienced by, you know, so many of the -- of the panelists. You know, Brad Watson and Scott and Dorian Abbot, and, well, really, you know, most the people here. How is it, you know, prohibiting viewpoint discrimination, it sounds good, but Scott read a list of things 7 that happened to him or people he knows, and I'm just wondering whether either a statute or an ed department regulation can even be written to address the most critical of those things? 10 MR. EITEL: Yeah. So be -- let me be clear. I 11 do not think there should be an education department role in 12 the enforcement of any kind of viewpoint discrimination civil 13 rights law. I -- that -- right out of it, no regulations. This is a -- a civil rights of 1964 Title 7, Title VI type of 15 statute enforced by the courts, the private litigation. I 16 It -- it will be difficult to draft, it will be 17 unintended consequences. Yes, it will protect, you know, 18 the -- the national socialist who, you know, teaches, you know 19 S&M on the side and causes controversies and all -- you know, 20 all two of them. 21 But it would also protect people like Dr. Atlas 22 and his colleagues who have been persecuted. And I think 23 that's the far greater concern that we need to -- to be -- to 24 be worried about. So again, to stress, no rule for -- for federal agency enforcement, simply through private litigation.

1 MR. CORCORAN: I -- again, I think the 2 institutes are a great idea, but it's just going to be a very incremental process. And -- and I think what you said after that is -- I mean, because I think ours that we just started, the first one in the state's going to have 50 to 100 students. 6 There's one in Arizona State. Robbie George started the one 7 in -- in Princeton. I mean, it's -- it's -- it's very -- it's snail-pace change. 9 And then they also run into the problem of 10 finding the right people to run them. I mean, they -- they 11 choose the wrong leader of that institute, and then it, to your 12 point, just gets coopted and becomes just like the rest of the 13 university. 14 But I would say, on all the things that we've 15 done when we do civics reform, rewriting standards, and everything I've done in public service, there's always that 16 17 argument, Well, if we do this and all of a sudden there's a 18 regime change, you know, won't they -- you know, they have the 19 opportunity to do that. And the answer's true, which is why I 20 say, we should seize the day and do as much as we possibly can 21 with everything we have while we are in control and then trust 22 on the fact that at -- in the end -- it might be apocalyptic, 23 but in the end, truth will always stand. 24 MR. RAUH: I just want to state one follow-up thing with this, is you know, the Princeton -- president of

```
1
   Princeton defended his actions against Josh (Inaudible) and the
   (inaudible) continual maligning of him on a website by saying,
   This is my freedom of speech right to do this. So, you know, I
   just -- I -- I want to believe that it's possible to write
   statutes to be able to stop that, but I -- you know, how do
6
   you -- how do you rid this?
7
                  MR. EITEL: Well -- well, the issue there is
   that there was a negative employment action based on his -- on
   his point of view, right, that his -- you know, he's a
10
   well-established professor at the university who articulated,
11
   you know, frankly, a mainstream view and lost his position
   because of it. That -- I think that is the difference.
12
13
                  MR. ZYWICKI: Richard, did you have something to
   add or no?
15
                               I mean, I -- I don't have much
                  MR. LOWERY:
16
   optimism for the institutes, and I don't think it takes time
17
   for them to be captured. They're now -- the system's in place.
18
   Any sort of institute gets captured instantaneously, so it's
19
   not even conquest law, it's a conquest event.
20
                  MR. ZYWICKI: The -- the -- the administrators
21
   are playing the long game here, right? They know -- they --
   they know the end state and I think Richard said it best and
22
23
   let -- if the donors are not willing to walk away in the end,
24
   then the administrators will steal their money. And, you know,
   and the donors often will exchange it for, you know, a game at
```

1 the -- in the president's box, right? 2 Second thing is, yeah, we have Robbie George. 3 We all look at -- we all know Robbie George's success story. You know who else knows that? They do. Right? They basically said, We don't want one of those Robbie George things on our 6 campus, right? So like Ro- -- it's precisely because Robbie 7 George has been so successful that no other university or very few other universities has actually been able to re-create Robbie George because they do what they did to Richard, right? 10 Which is a cut him off at the knees before they can actually 11 set something up with real academic freedom. 12 Todd, can I just add one thing? So MR. EITEL: 13 there's an undercurrent to this conversation, and maybe I'm mistaken, that there's going to be a silver bullet to solve all 15 these problems or some cat- -- you know, cataclysmic 16 Napoleonic-style battle for the soul of the country that we 17 fight and we win and walk off into the sunset. No. This is a 18 daily battle that we'll need to fight for the rest of our 19 lives, and our children will have to fight it and probably our 20 grandchildren. It's a battlefield and that's the way it's 21 going to be. That's just the way it is. 22 MR. ZYWICKI: Yeah. The Gromshe (phonetic) 23 project took how many generations for the left to capture the 24 institutions? So do we have time for one more or were you calling it a day?

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible.) 2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you so much. Okay. 3 Mr. Lowery, I want to say, I completely agree with you, which I know is weird because I'm 19, I'm supposed to be optimistic, but I think you're completely right that the conservative movement right now is just full of losers. And I think there's 7 really two reasons. I think, number one, many of them are so afraid of the word "racist" that they just totally give the left all the ground on that. And then I think second, which you really identified correctly, is this, like, obsession with 10 11 institutions and, you know, limited government, which I think 12 would be good in, like, a virtuous society, but we really need to sort of use the vessels that we have. So I just want to say 13 I agree with you. 15 I -- I guess I have two questions. The first 16 is, like, for someone like me who's young, who wants to sort of 17 try to win over as many young conservatives to my side, you 18 know, get them -- stop being afraid of what the left thinks of 19 them, what advice do you have? 20 And then secondly, I'm just curious, what do you 21 think of, like, Ron DeSantis and his sort of mode of 22 governance. And then, you know, do you think this count- --23 you know, if you had 49 other Ron DeSantises, do you think, you 24 know, you would be more optimistic or do you think he's also kind of a grifter? I'm kind of curious where you think on

that.

MR. LOWERY: I can -- I can answer the second part easily. Yeah, if we had 49 Ron DeSantises, things would get better, but we have one Ron DeSantis. And, you know, the gap between Ron DeSantis and the next person is just too large to really make a difference in higher ed, at least.

And as far as advice, I haven't been very effective at persuading anybody of anything, so whatever you guys are doing is working, 'cause you're like 19 years old and you're on a panel and you're getting videoed and you're going to be streamed, so what you're doing may work, but you just -- I mean, just -- you just gotta grind through it. But, you know, what I did doesn't --

MR. ZYWICKI: I'll bet Ron DeSantis does understand game theory, Ron DeSantis does understand tit for tat and he understands the sucker strategy is not a -- not a -- a winning strategy, right? Which is, I think -- and I won't ask Richard the case, but Ron DeSantis seems to have figured out Saul Alinsky, whether he's read him or not, right? But the basic point is, ever since that Disney thing, notice that corporate America's been very quiet since the Daub's opinion because -- and DeSantis isn't retaliating, but DeSantis is basically saying, tit for tat gets us back to neutrality. That's what we want to have, right, we want to have neutrality across our corporations. We just need less politics in this --

1 in this country. 2 So I think -- so I think that's the model of 3 fighting power with power to try to reestablish an equilibrium. MR. LOWERY: But I live in Texas, so that's a 5 little different. 6 MR. ZYWICKI: And I would say on -- for you 7 guys, you guys are doing it right, which is have fun. should be fun. All right. That's what -- that's what -that's the Alinsky lesson, right, you want your followers to And the other side is so serious, right, and they're 10 11 so -- such a drag, right? 12 Can we get -- grab one right there? 13 MR. ATLAS: Okay. I think we're gonna -- we're going to call it a night here, although if people want to hang 15 out and ask questions, that's fine. I want to thank, of 16 course, this panel and all the other panelists. I thought it 17 was an awesome meeting myself. I want to thank Dr. Arnn, 18 Hillsdale, the Salem Center for Policy at the McComb School of 19 Business and the Global Liberty Institute for sponsoring this. 20 There were 25 panelists who took a financial hit 21 to do this. They didn't really make any money whatsoever. But 22 really very grateful that they participated. It was a great 23 discussion. I want to thank Jim Hankins for coming to give 24 a -- a really amazing keynote. I also want to thank my colleagues, Richard Lowery and Josh Rauh, who worked very hard

```
1
   to put the whole meeting together.
                                        Thanks --
2
                   (Applause.)
3
                   MR. ATLAS: Yes. I want to thank Amanda, Emma
   and Patrick, all of Hillsdale, who did all the logistical hard
   work here. The meeting went incredibly well, far as I'm
6
   concerned.
7
                   (Applause.)
8
                   MR. ATLAS: Yes. The audience, of course, for
            I hope you enjoyed it. Thank you for your support and
10
   for your future support in advance. And of course, I want to
11
   say to everybody, but particularly the young people, we never
12
   give up. Never.
                      Thank you very much.
13
                   (End of recording.)
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1 CERTIFICATE 2 I, TERRI GARCIA, Certified Shorthand Reporter in and for 3 the State of Texas, certify that the foregoing is a correct 4 transcription from the audio recording of the proceedings in 5 the above-entitled matter. 6 I further certify that I am neither counsel for, related 7 to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which this hearing was taken, and further that I am not financially 9 or otherwise interested in the outcome of the action. 10 I further certify that the transcription fee of 11 _____ was paid/will be paid in full by 12 13 14 15 16 Terri Garcia, Texas Certified Shorthand Reporter No. 6581 17 Dickman Davenport, Inc. Firm Registration No. #312 18 4228 North Central Expressway Suite 101 19 Dallas, Texas 75206 (214) 855-5100 20 My commission expires: 7-31-23 21 22 23 24 25

	action 29:23 43:8	17:2 20:24	argument 6:16	30:24
	49:7,9	allowed 35:5	8:3 35:12 42:17	ball 4:13
AAR 7:3 Aaron 3:22 13:7	actions 43:1	alumni 22:25	arguments 5:16	based 2:25 27:9
	active 20:3	Amanda 48:3	5:17	32:15 43:8
Abbot 41:4 able 20:19 25:12	activities 21:16	amazing 3:7	Arizona 42:6	basic 26:12 46:20
	25:7	47:24	Arnn 47:17	basically 9:4,10
29:15,22 40:9 43:5 44:8	add 39:5 43:14	amend 27:5,13	articulated 43:10	9:11,20,21
	44:12	Amendment 11:2	asked 15:21	10:18 11:16
abolish 27:8 abolished 24:11	address 41:1,9	11:7,9,13,16	16:21 29:25	12:3,6,15 15:24
24:20	admini- 39:20	amendments	30:13,15 38:23	16:8,12 17:11
abounds 38:5	administration	26:7,7	asking 6:20	17:12,14 18:12
abounds 38.3	24:18 29:20	America 12:16	assert 15:5	33:10 44:4
49:5	38:23 39:11,18	America's 1:8	asserting 40:15	46:23
absolute 35:17	administrations	2:2 46:21	assistance 25:5	basis 10:17 27:12
absolutely 21:1	39:21	American 24:13	assure 29:5	27:12
29:12	administrative	38:16	Atlas 2:2 29:19	batting 2:8
academic 13:3	19:6 39:10	announced 14:11	29:19 30:7,8	battle 31:2 44:16
18:9 20:3,3	administrators	14:13 29:16	41:21 47:13	44:18
21:22,24,25	12:14,24 13:5	answer 17:18	48:3,8	battlefield 44:20
22:3,6 30:11	43:20,24	46:2	attempts 22:22	bear 18:10
44:11	adopt 27:24	answer's 42:19	attention 5:21	beat 16:1,2
academics 9:13	32:10	Antonin 2:5	19:19 29:1	beef 26:13 28:17
22:8,9 25:19	adopted 32:11	anybody 3:14	attorney's 25:15	beefed 27:18
31:15	advance 5:16	46:8	audience 48:8	begins 2:1
academies 25:23	48:10	anyone's 22:6	audio 49:4	believe 5:2,3,4,23
accept 33:11	advice 45:19 46:7	anytime 18:1	Austin 26:24,24	9:22 14:16 43:4
acceptable 16:25	affidavit 3:2	apart 35:25	authorities 32:5	believes 4:8
22:2	afraid 45:8,18	apocalyptic	authority 4:19	14:18
accommodating	after- 41:2	42:22	20:23 26:19	Ben 13:1
22:10	age 23:5,6,8	apologize 14:25	authorized 35:4	benefits 31:3
account- 37:12	agencies 27:9,20	29:4	available 35:23	best 23:9 43:22
accountability	27:22 34:3	appeal 18:17	awake 2:9	bet 46:14
34:10 36:10,14	agency 25:2 33:6	Applause 48:2,7	aware 8:13	betraying 22:3
37:13	33:10 41:25	application 34:21	awesome 47:17	Betsy 26:16
accredit 27:11	ages 3:24 5:10	apply 33:8,10	awful 13:13	33:22 36:16
accreditation	35:15	appointment		better 22:11 46:4
27:4,9,18,20,22	ago 2:12 11:7	13:2	<u>B</u>	beyond 16:10,14
33:6,10 34:3	agree 41:16 45:3	appreciate 4:1,2	back 2:12 4:16	Bhattacharya
accredited 28:5	45:14	6:12 34:12 40:5	7:13,21 8:21,22	16:5,6 29:21
33:13,21	ahold 8:4	approved 15:10	19:17,18 23:7	30:5
accreditors 28:3	algebra's 37:24	15:11	23:10 30:9	Bhattacharya's
accurate 15:25	Alinsky 16:12,12	architect 24:6	31:20 32:4	30:2
act 2:10 22:5	16:13,14 21:7	area 24:22	33:19 46:23	big 12:22 18:23
25:3 27:4,9	46:19 47:9	arguably 31:19	bad 6:6,6 10:3	18:24,25 28:8
28:14	allow 9:7 11:4	arguing 13:24	22:20 23:14	bigger 32:6
			<u> </u>	

h: 4 21.2		20.22	CNIN 20.2	
biggest 31:3	C	centuries 38:22	CNN 30:3	completely 28:21
bill 34:22 35:2,8	C 49:1,1	CEO 9:5,7	co-panelist 12:10	30:4 35:4,4,5
billions 36:20	cabinets 34:14	CEOs 8:25 31:13	cockroaches	45:3,5
biological 26:10	California 27:16	certain 11:17,18	34:14 38:12	compromise
birth 26:10	call 5:10 19:9	14:8	codes 2:20 13:23	14:21 15:2
bit 30:1 36:13	47:14	certainly 39:9	14:5	con- 8:21 12:19
black 17:8	called 23:21	Certified 49:2,16	codify 26:15	28:22
board 2:13 3:4	calling 29:5	certify 49:3,6,10	cofounder 24:3	conceived 39:8
8:25 9:2,13,14	44:25	challenge 13:11	collateral 16:25	concept 21:23
9:15 12:14	cameras 35:22	13:19 22:15	colleagues 17:23	concern 41:23
31:21,22	38:10	challenged 11:6	25:20 41:22	concerned 8:12
boards 31:11,13	campus 4:17 6:13	challenges 21:17	47:25	8:17 48:6
Bob 23:21 39:5	11:5 14:24	chambers 13:13	college 2:13	concur 24:11
Bonevac 14:24	16:22 21:19	change 13:14	16:20 27:1	condition 12:2
20:5 40:12	26:5,20 44:6	28:22 42:8,18	33:25	38:25
booster 6:8 16:20	campuses 13:12	changed 7:5	colleges 20:22	conditions 25:20
16:23	13:24	changer 35:13	28:1,25 31:12	confer 20:20
bottom 30:20	cancel 25:18 29:6	Chicago 32:9	32:11,25,25	conferred 20:1,9
bou- 4:22	29:7	chief 16:4,6	33:20 38:2	conform 27:1
bow 37:11	candidate 2:13	chiefs 30:15	combat 28:10	Congress 24:18
box 31:24 44:1	12:16	child 29:12	come 8:5 18:20	24:24 26:4,6
boycott 14:12	candidates 12:20	children 36:3	19:18 21:2 34:1	27:5,8,13 28:9
boys 6:8	candidates 12.20 capable 12:20	44:19	37:9	connection 24:8
Brad 41:3	capture 44:23	China 28:11	comes 36:24	conquest 40:12
break 17:13,15	captured 43:17	Chinese 28:12	coming 47:23	43:19,19
17:16	43:18	choose 34:1,2	48:9	consequence
brief 11:8 30:2	care 30:24	42:11	commandeered	7:20
briefly 18:11	career 6:6	civics 37:24	17:5	consequences
38:15	careful 10:1	42:15	comments 30:18	7:19,24 8:15,17
bring 10:16 18:9	cartels 27:9	civil 23:24 39:12	commission	10:4 11:19
brought 38:18	cartels 27.9 case 3:2 7:25	39:22 41:12,14	49:20	36:14 41:17
Buckley 8:23,24		claim 2:18 12:4	committee 33:16	conservative
budget 36:21	10:20 12:25	clarify 26:9	Communist	8:22 12:19,19
build 20:17	46:18	class 4:18 18:18	28:12	14:15 21:18,19
building 9:12	cases 13:10,12	20:7 32:21	community	22:8,9 23:23
bullet 44:14	16:23	classic 16:14	32:25	24:17,18 27:8
bunch 9:3,13	cat- 44:15	classroom 35:3,9	competence	32:17 45:5
11:6,8	cataclysmic	classrooms 35:22	10:19	conservatives
bureaucratic	44:15	cleanup 2:8	competition 34:5	21:6,7,10,23
9:11	cause 25:17 46:9	clear 3:20 10:14	complain 11:13	22:16 24:22
bureaucrats 22:1	causes 41:19	41:10	12:3	45:17
burst 15:14	cell 35:3	clerks 14:13	complaints 13:18	consistent 39:1
business 21:15	Center 47:18	close 16:17 36:24	39:17	constituency
47:19	centers 14:23	close 10.17 30.24 closely 39:6	complete 18:18	21:5
	26:25	_	_	constrained 8:8
buy 4:23	Central 49:18	club 32:6	19:4,20 20:4	constrained 8:8
			<u> </u>	

contingency	47:16 48:8,10	15:23 36:17	detail 16:18 17:1	doing 3:7,16 9:8
28:23	courses 40:9	42:20 44:25	details 18:23	11:21 12:6,9,11
continual 43:2	Court 30:2	de- 20:24	determine 22:1	18:15 25:8
continue 5:25	courtroom 13:9	deal 17:10,11	develop 12:13	29:19 30:21
7:14 20:11 37:9	courts 13:11 25:9	24:22	DeVos 26:16	35:8 37:17 39:6
contracts 28:20	41:15	dealing 6:12	33:23	46:9,11 47:7
contribution	COVID 2:7,25	14:19	DeVos's 24:4	dollars 32:20
18:4	29:5,13 35:16	dean 9:18,18	DFI 24:2	dollars' 36:20
contributions	35:22	14:13 17:4	dialogue 5:12	dominance 3:13
28:19	crazy 22:12	dean's 12:7,8	Dickman 49:17	5:14,15,17,24
control 42:21	create 20:15,22	decades 23:9	DIE 17:5	6:2,23
controlled 27:19	25:1,9 32:16,17	35:2,19,21	difference 12:6	dominant 4:18
controversial	34:6	decent 6:4	43:12 46:6	Don 14:24
38:10	created 32:12	decide 10:19	different 2:20 5:8	donors 20:18
controversies	creating 8:19	27:14	9:20 25:23 47:5	22:14,25 31:12
41:19	18:17	decisions 25:6	difficult 19:13	43:23,25
conversation	creative 20:15	declaratory	27:5 36:13	doomed 23:1
23:25 44:13	credit 2:18 40:9	25:14	41:16	Dorian 41:4
conversations	criteria 31:25	deduction 5:1	difficulty 24:15	dorms 26:12
34:5	critical 20:7	defend 16:2,9,10	27:3	downhill 15:2
convincing 22:20	21:14 41:9	17:22	directly 28:7	downward 37:23
coopted 42:12	crowd 17:6	defended 16:4	disagree 23:20	dozen 14:11
Corcoran 29:3,4	CRT 19:5 35:18	43:1	disciplinary	Dr 29:19,19,21
34:17 42:1	37:3	Defensive 23:22	26:13	30:2,5,7,8
corporate 31:13	crutch 18:15	defer 21:13 31:15	disclose 28:19,21	41:21 47:17
32:3 33:16	culture 25:18	degree 7:21 20:1	disclosure 28:13	draft 41:16
46:21	curious 45:20,25	20:8 32:18	28:18	drag 47:11
corporations	curriculum	degrees 20:20	discriminate	dragged 40:17
46:25	19:23 22:1	DEI 19:5,16 26:5	10:16 38:25	due 26:12
correct 49:3	curve 26:4	26:20 28:2	discriminates	
correctly 45:10	cut 44:10	39:13	10:14	E 49:1,1
correlated 18:2	D	department 24:4	discrimination	earlier 2:24 3:23
costs 25:15 counsel 49:6	daily 44:18	24:7,11,15 25:10,10 26:16	25:3,6 40:24,25 41:6,12	4:8 6:19 7:17
count 17:8 32:25	Dallas 49:19	28:16,17 38:18	discussion 9:14	12:13,25 13:6
40:19	damage 16:25	40:22 41:8,11	47:23	14:24 27:1
count- 45:22	damages 25:13	dependancy	dishonest 4:11	easily 46:3
counties 36:22	dark 3:24 23:5,6	40:23	dismiss 10:1	easy 10:20
country 31:19	23:8	DeSantis 30:13	dismissing 39:18	economist 7:12
36:18 44:16	Dartmouth 2:13	45:21 46:4,5,14	Disney 46:20	economists 7:1
47:1	2:21 9:2,14	46:15,18,22,22	dive 26:6	ed 24:14,25 28:11
couple 2:11 3:10	12:14,17,21	DeSantises 45:23	diverse 17:7	31:4 39:13
14:20	Daub's 46:21	46:3	diversity 4:1,2,25	40:22 41:8 46:6
course 17:17	Davenport 49:17	designed 16:3	17:7 24:25	educating 18:22
29:18 31:12	day 13:25,25	destroys 21:25	27:24 34:6,24	education 18:20

	l		1	
23:23 24:4,8,11	environment	existing 5:24	46:7 48:5	33:4
24:13 25:10	25:24 32:18	6:17,22,25 34:1	farm 12:13,24	flags 20:6
26:16,23 27:4	EOC 13:18	exists 4:23 5:2	13:4 32:17	flat-out 39:15
28:14,16 30:16	equilibrium 7:21	27:12	faster 8:1	flick 34:13 38:12
34:19 35:18,25	47:3	expecting 15:13	FDA 15:10,13	Florida 12:8,9
36:20 38:18	equity 27:25	experience 21:3	federal 11:3,4	29:7,13 30:7,12
41:11	error 4:24 6:14	experienced 41:2	14:11 23:23,25	31:5,22 32:15
educational 25:7	6:15,15	expert 3:1 18:6,8	24:1,3,12,16	33:8 34:3,16,17
25:24 27:24	especially 14:23	29:22	25:1,5 26:21	36:23 37:8 38:2
EEOC 25:11	essential 21:1	expires 49:20	33:22 37:6	Florida's 13:1
effective 46:8	essentially 12:18	explained 4:17	38:25 41:25	focus 12:12 23:25
effects 25:3	established 4:8	explicit 20:6	fee 49:10	24:2,7 36:11
efforts 8:22	8:8 21:12	expression 5:20	feeling 27:16	focused 23:23
Eitel 23:16,21	establishment	Expressway	fees 25:15	40:5
34:16 39:7	26:22	49:18	fellow 2:15	foible 17:17
41:10 43:7	evade 39:4	extended 39:24	felt 12:3	folded 3:3
44:12	evening 41:2		fences 16:9	folks 8:5 30:9,23
either 5:16 7:15	event 43:19	F	fight 2:6 7:13,16	33:17
40:21 41:8	every- 24:9	F 8:23 49:1	31:7 44:17,18	follow 2:10
el- 14:17	everybody 2:9	face 14:3	44:19	follow-up 42:24
elected 2:12,14	5:12 10:12 14:4	face-to-face	fighting 47:3	followers 47:9
35:25	17:12 40:1	29:14	figure 13:4	following 26:8
elegant 25:8	48:11	fact 11:13 29:24	figured 46:18	football 22:18
Elizabeth 8:4,6	everything's	34:19 38:6	filed 11:8 38:19	31:24
eluded 2:23 4:8	22:20	42:22	final 28:9 33:18	footprint 34:4
12:13	evidence 18:13	factor 26:1	33:18	for- 28:20
emergency 29:17	Exact- 23:11	facts 30:6	finalist 12:20	force 36:8
Emma 48:3	exactly 17:8,9,9	faculty 3:5 9:1,19	financial 25:5	forefront 29:12
empire 9:11	26:17 35:9	33:17 34:20,22	47:20	foregoing 49:3
employed 37:18	example 11:2	34:25 37:21	financially 49:8	foreign 28:10,20
49:7	12:1 13:18	fail 22:7	finding 42:10	form 7:3,4
employer 2:24	14:10 16:19	failed 18:8	fine 47:15	fortunes 21:9
employment 25:6	20:1 26:23	failure 18:18	fire 6:5 10:6,7,7	four 24:5 31:5
25:21 43:8	39:22	fair 13:10 16:1	16:4,5	32:3,20 37:15
encourage 26:21	examples 3:8	18:7	fired 25:20	fraction 22:9
ended 37:1,2	8:19	fairer 34:6	Firm 49:17	framework 4:15
ends 3:21,24	exams 37:25	faith-based 27:21	first 3:11 8:16,20	frankly 43:11
enforce 11:13	excessive 21:10	fall 31:14	11:1,7 15:12	free 4:16,17,24
enforced 41:15	exchange 43:25	falling 31:17,17	19:4 24:24	5:25 11:16,24
enforcement	executed 39:8	false 19:3	29:10 33:14	12:1,2,4 14:14
41:12,25	executive 24:13	familiar 11:3	38:16 42:5	14:16 19:11
enjoyed 48:9	executives 32:3	family 21:9	45:15	38:4
ensure 28:18	exemption 26:15	famous 38:19	five 2:21 16:23	freedom 20:3,4
29:12	exemptions	far 19:16 22:12	22:9 32:20	21:22,24,25
entire 30:8 41:1	25:22 26:13	31:16 41:23	fix 1:8 2:2 18:19	22:3,6 23:22
<u> </u>				

42.2.44.11	12 6 14 2 5 7 0	17.14	.64 22 22 24	11 1: 26.25
43:3 44:11	42:6 44:2,5,7,9	47:14	grifter 22:23,24	Haskins 26:25
freshmen 37:15	George's 44:3	gonna 47:13	23:1 45:25	Hatfields 7:22
friends 23:17	getting 2:20 10:2	good 6:4,11 11:2	grifters 22:10	HEA 27:6,13,13
25:17 30:13	17:21,22 21:1	20:19 22:19	grind 46:12	27:18
Fryer's 7:2	38:25,25 46:10	32:13 35:11	Gromshe 44:22	Health 15:11
full 45:6 49:11	gifts 28:19	39:21 41:6	groom 13:4	hear 12:8 15:22
fully 28:21	give 3:6,22 8:19	45:12	ground 15:5,6	21:6
fun 16:15 47:7,8	14:10 16:25	gotta 46:12	45:9	heard 5:7 6:18
47:10	17:8 24:23,23	gotten 29:4 37:2	group 22:10	13:6 15:4 16:13
functioning	30:3 45:8 47:23	37:3	23:21,23	24:23 40:7 41:1
19:11	48:12	gov- 11:12	growth 26:22	hearing 13:10
fundamentally	Global 40:3	governance	guarantee 3:19	27:16 49:8
5:8 7:5 19:10	47:19	27:14 45:22	guess 2:10 17:25	heartfelt 30:6
funding 11:4,17	go 11:14 18:24	government 11:1	38:14 45:15	height 29:13
28:23 37:10,11	20:12,20 22:12	11:9,11,12	gutter 8:2	herd 8:25
40:23	22:18 23:1	20:13 33:22	guy 9:15,16	Hey 29:6,25 33:8
funds 39:1	29:25 30:9	34:10 45:11	14:17	hiding 4:13
funny 15:15	31:23 32:18	government's	guys 29:11 36:10	hierarchies 21:11
further 49:6,8,10	33:9 34:11,13	37:6	46:9 47:7,7	21:12
future 23:18	35:11 39:13,23	governments		hierarchy 5:15
24:17,18 27:1	40:14	11:25 28:10,20	H	5:17 6:18 21:18
48:10	God 8:23	governor 29:24	half 31:5	high 15:5,6
	goes 5:19 8:21,22	30:13 31:20	halfway 15:3	higher 18:20
G	15:1 32:8 33:8	32:4 33:7	Hamilton 32:14	24:14,25 26:23
game 5:9,11,15	35:10	grab 47:12	hands 35:23	27:4 28:11,14
5:15,25 6:1,2	going 2:3 3:6,10	graciously 3:1	hang 47:14	31:4 39:13 46:6
7:10,12 17:14	3:11,17,18,19	grade 9:16,23	Hankins 18:5	highly 18:2
17:15 22:18	3:19 4:5,15	graduate 20:8	47:23	Hillsdale 23:12
35:13 43:21,25	7:13 8:1 10:6,6	graduating 37:15	happen 14:4	47:18 48:4
46:15	10:13,18 11:17	graduation 19:23	18:24,25 19:1	hiring 10:15
game-changing	13:2 14:4,10,12	20:25	19:12 21:21	14:12
31:8 33:7	15:18,19 17:16	grandchildren	23:19 26:3 27:6	history 20:18
games 31:24	17:17 18:22	44:20	33:2 40:18	hit 47:20
gap 46:5	20:11,21,25	Grant 37:16,17	happened 7:8	hobbyhorse 28:8
Garcia 49:2,16	21:4,5 23:13,19	Grants 24:20	41:7	hold 23:13 32:6
gatekeeper 27:23	23:25 24:16,19	grateful 47:22	happens 8:4 36:5	39:2 40:16
gender 26:10	27:16 28:15	gravely 21:22	37:22	honor 2:3 27:20
35:20 37:3	29:1 31:25 32:1	great 3:8 20:17	happy 22:13,14	Hoover 2:15
general 3:6	33:11 34:6,19	31:6 32:2 33:5	harassment	hope 19:4 48:9
generations	34:24 35:9,19	36:18 38:5 42:2	26:18	hour 16:13
44:23	35:20,21 36:1,6	47:22	hard 10:21 14:3	house 30:12
generis 13:1	36:21 37:13	greater 37:7	47:25 48:4	38:17
George 2:4,21,22	38:11,16 40:13	38:11 41:23	harder 10:21,22	hurdles 40:11
15:9,15,19,21	40:17 42:2,5	greatest 18:6,8	hardheaded 8:24	hypocrites 4:2,10
16:3 17:5 26:2	44:14,21 46:10	35:17	9:3	hypothesis 6:20
	77.17,21 70.10	33.17		in pomesis 0.20
	I	I	I	I

	24:14	instruction 29:14	judge 14:18	40:15,19,23
idea 4:22 10:3	inclusion 27:25	insurgent 2:13	judges 14:11	41:2,3,4,5,17
11:15,23 19:10	incompatible	insurgents 21:12	justice 25:10	41:18,18,19
20:17 30:24	19:10 21:18	intellectual 4:1	28:16	42:18,18,25
33:6 42:2	incredibly 48:5	4:24 24:25		43:3,5,9,11,21
	incremental 42:3	intellectually	K	43:22,24,25
idealogical 4:2 19:9 20:2	indefensible 16:9	4:11	K-12 35:14,15	44:3,4,15 45:4
ideas 1:8 2:2 8:16	17:22	interested 49:9	38:3,10 39:14	45:11,18,22,23
19:10,14,21	independent	interesting 3:8	kangaroo 13:11	45:24 46:4,13
22:2 24:24	20:15,22	interim 38:9	keep 2:9 3:16	knows 11:12
30:25 32:13	individuals 31:19	internet 23:8	22:14	13:23 14:4
identified 45:10	inflation 9:17,24	introduce 2:4	keeps 22:14	17:12 41:7 44:4
identity 26:10	influence 26:19	invest- 39:12	keynote 47:24	Kulldorff 16:7
ideological 3:12	28:10 35:20	investigated	kicked 2:16	
ideology 10:15	36:21	39:18	kicking 40:12	L
10:17,18	information 23:7	investigations	kids 30:9 32:18	lack 22:11 37:11
idiot 9:21,22	inherited 5:9	39:12	37:18	large 22:13 46:5
ignored 6:24	injunctive 25:14	involved 22:23	kind 6:12 13:1	late 34:11 40:6
illegitimate 5:17	innovative 26:22	38:17	35:12 36:7	laughing 15:14
imbalances 5:6	inquiry 19:11	involves 19:22	41:12 45:25,25	law 2:5,5 11:3,6,8
immediate 37:18	insane 20:25	ironically 6:14	kitchen 30:23	14:12 17:13,15
immediately 3:3	insanity 2:6	Israeli 14:1	34:11,13	17:16 41:13
29:16 31:13	20:21	issue 2:11 25:9	knee 37:11	43:19
33:9,19,24	inside 3:4	25:11 27:15,17	knees 44:10	laws 8:6 40:21,24
36:15	insights 6:21	29:1 43:7	know 2:4,19 3:12	lawsuit 15:8
immunity 2:25	instance 26:6	issues 23:24	3:21,25 4:12 6:1 7:1 8:3,10	lawyer 30:11
15:16	instantaneously	24:22 25:2	8:13 10:7,17,23	lazy 9:1 lead 7:20,22
impact 30:25	43:18	27:15	11:11 12:5,5,6	23:21
implemented	institute 22:13	it'll 23:8	13:8,24,25 14:6	leader 2:6 31:6
14:6	23:22 32:12,14	IV 24:19 25:4	15:20,22 16:8	33:7 36:18
implications 6:13	32:14,20 40:4 42:11 43:18	27:23 28:6,23 Ivy 12:22	17:17 18:1 19:8	42:11
important 5:4	47:19	IX 13:10,11 24:6	19:13,19 20:6	leaders 18:12
13:5,20,21	institutes 40:8	25:11 26:5,6,9	20:17 21:6 22:8	leadership 18:17
14:18,21 40:2	42:2 43:16	26:15,16,19	22:14 23:6	24:4 27:14 31:5
importantly	institution 5:5	20.13,10,17	24:15 29:2 30:5	37:22
25:14	21:14,17,17	J	30:14 31:11,18	League 12:23
impose 20:13	28:19	jail 21:15	32:16,21,23,24	leave 19:18
impressions 3:6 inappropriate	institutional	Jay 3:1 4:8 7:16	32:24 33:15	led 35:24
18:14	25:25 27:21	16:5,6 29:21	34:10,11,14,22	left 4:1,8,9,9,13
inaudible 6:9	institutions 20:16	Jim 47:23	34:25 35:7,7,10	10:5,14,14
23:3 43:1,2	21:11,13 25:4	job 23:12 29:22	35:12 36:10,16	11:20 12:5
45:1	26:22 27:21,24	join 20:12	36:20 37:14,23	13:22 19:2,3
incentives 8:19	40:4,10,18	Josh 39:24 43:1	38:10,20 39:4,9	22:15 25:18
including 24:5,14	44:24 45:11	47:25	39:11 40:1,3,3	40:17 44:23

45:9,18	loans 28:6	Mason 2:5,21,22	40:14	18:23,24,25
legal 19:5 29:23	locations 27:10	15:9,15,21 16:3	missions 26:1	19:24 20:4,22
35:4 38:16	logic 18:13	17:5 26:2	misspoke 14:25	26:7,9,24,25
legislation 33:24	logistical 48:4	Mason's 15:19	mistaken 44:14	27:8,11,12,18
legislative 19:5	long 16:17 19:7	matter 37:14	misunderstood	27:22 28:17,17
legislatures 21:8	20:10 22:21	49:5	21:22	28:21 29:20,25
legitimate 5:18	23:6 43:21	matters 14:16	mode 45:21	35:14 41:23
11:9	longer 30:25	McComb 47:18	model 39:1 47:2	44:18 45:12
lesbian 17:8	33:12	McCoys 7:23	moderate 2:7	46:25
lesson 47:9	look 11:19 31:10	mean 4:3 5:18,23	moderated 2:3	needed 21:19
lessons 16:11	44:3	7:9 8:10 10:13	moderately	needle 34:9 36:8
let's 3:18 8:11,11	looked 22:22	10:23 13:24	12:19	needs 26:3,4,6,10
8:13,13,13	lose 7:15 28:24	23:11 31:2 33:1	Moderna 16:1	26:12,13,15
letter 28:15 32:10	losers 45:6	33:2,15 39:7	moment 23:4	27:5,13 28:9
38:20,20	losing 29:6	42:4,7,10 43:15	26:20	37:8
leveraging 27:22	loss 9:9	46:12	monastery 23:10	negative 25:21
liberal 31:18	lost 23:7 43:11	meaning 40:13	monetary 25:13	43:8
36:21 37:10	lot 7:1 9:24 10:22	means 7:9 19:14	25:13	negotiate 14:22
liberalism 38:5	12:25 14:23	26:10	money 43:24	neither 18:16
liberation 5:5	29:19 30:18,19	measure 37:13	47:21	49:6
Libertarian	30:19 31:12,12	meeting 47:17	moral 15:5,5	neutrality 7:21
23:23	36:12,14 37:8	48:1,5	move 34:8 36:8	46:23,24
liberties 39:21	38:18 40:7,10	member 3:5	moved 18:21,21	never 9:23 14:4
liberty 39:23	40:10	members 9:1,15	movement 45:6	16:15 21:11
40:3 47:19	love 22:16	34:20,22 37:21	moves 39:10	48:11,12
lights 34:13	Lowery 17:25	men 16:22	myocarditis	new 26:22
38:12	18:4 23:4,11	mentioned 2:24	16:23	nice 14:15 19:13
limit 10:12,13	43:15 45:3 46:2	18:5 20:5 23:5		night 34:11 40:6
26:18	47:4,25	36:11	N 161617	47:14
limitations 13:2		met 34:21	name 16:16,17	nine 30:1
limited 25:21		Microphone 18:3	17:2,3,20,20	noninterference
29:2 45:11	mach 32:23	Middle 5:9	name's 23:21	21:24,25
limits 10:23	mainstream	mildly 12:19	29:3	nonprofit 9:11
line 30:20 35:1	43:11	military 11:5	Napoleonic-style	North 49:18
linings 35:16,17	making 37:24	25:22	44:16	notes 17:16
list 41:6	maligning 43:2	million 32:20	nasty 28:15	notice 46:20
literally 34:4	Man 8:23	33:1 38:3	national 27:11	nowadays 13:9
litigation 13:8	managed 2:15	mine 28:8	41:18	nucleus 27:1
29:17 38:19	mandate 2:25	minimal 24:14	nationwide 36:7	nuisance 2:16
41:15,25	15:10 16:20	mint 20:11	natural 2:25	number 5:3
little 8:9 20:15	26:12 27:23	minting 20:12	15:16 18:15	16:21,23,24
30:1 36:13 47:5	mandates 37:1,2	minute 8:14	necessary 19:9	17:1 45:7
live 47:4	Marcuse 4:16,17	38:15	need 5:20 6:11	nurture 24:25
lives 44:19	Martin 16:7	mis- 6:6	8:17,18,24	0
loan 27:23	mask 37:1	mission 27:10,21	12:13 17:7	
	l	l	l	l

	l	I	l	
objective 37:21	23:15,18 45:4	Party 28:12	place 12:21 13:9	power 4:9,9,11
oblige 28:14	45:24	pass 8:6 25:2	19:18 22:2	4:14 5:6,24 6:2
obsession 45:10	order 19:25 20:7	37:25	26:17 31:14	6:17,22 7:10,16
obtain 26:14	29:17	passed 33:24	36:19 43:17	7:16 11:2,9
obvious 13:2	organization	Patrick 48:4	plaintiff 25:12,16	12:25 14:8,8,9
obviously 10:14	15:11 40:13	pay 29:1	play 5:25 26:1	19:6 21:23
OCR 39:11	organizations	paying 5:21	played 31:4	22:15 24:13
offensive 16:10	27:20	19:19	playing 5:8,9,14	26:4,19 36:23
offer 40:9	original 40:14	Pell 24:20 37:16	5:15 6:2 7:10	36:25 37:4,6
offered 29:13	originally 30:21	37:17	8:8 17:14,15	39:13 40:22
office 12:8 25:1,9	outcome 49:9	people 2:4 4:20	43:21	47:3,3
39:13,22	outcomes 31:8	6:4,5,5,7,11,12	plays 6:3	powerarchy 6:25
officer 39:12	36:8	8:3 9:6 11:24	pleading 10:1	practice 11:21
offices 26:5,5,19	outrage 35:24,24	13:11 14:22	point 14:14 15:24	14:7
26:20 28:2	outside 20:16,18	16:12 18:13,14	15:24 16:8 28:7	practicing 22:4
Oh 19:15 22:12	overlap 18:2	18:16,22 19:14	28:9 32:16 36:2	precisely 7:7 44:6
okay 8:7 15:16	oversee 32:6	19:15 20:20,25	37:25 40:10	premise 3:17 4:6
17:6 33:19 45:2		21:9 22:16,17	42:12 43:9	4:7,23 16:16,18
47:13	P	22:18,18,20	46:20	17:2,12
old 18:16 21:10	paid 49:11	38:17 40:14	points 37:21	premises 3:11
23:6 46:9	paid/will 49:11	41:5,7,21 42:10	Pol- 14:25	presidency 12:21
ombudsman	Palestinian 14:1	47:14 48:11	police 7:2 25:10	president 9:4,5
11:24	pan- 12:10	percent 22:9,10	polices 25:2	9:12 12:17
ombudsmen 12:1	panel 2:7 3:7,17	perfect 26:23	policies 14:14	16:19,20,22
once 30:7	8:16 16:13	perimeters 16:15	27:25 28:2	22:18 27:7
one-and-only	32:19 38:16	persecuted 41:22	policy 1:8 2:2	36:18 38:21
39:8	46:10 47:16	person 2:19	16:3 23:22,24	42:25
ones 8:12 21:8,9	panelists 41:3	10:11 19:18	24:1,1,3 26:21	president's 31:24
23:19 33:15	47:16,20	46:5	47:18	44:1
open 5:12	parental 36:1	person's 22:12	political 20:9	presidents 12:22
opened 30:8	parents 16:21	personal 2:6 21:3	politicians 22:25	12:24 31:17
33:23 36:25	35:18,23 36:4	personnel 19:22	politics 46:25	32:7
opening 31:11	part 34:21 40:2	perspective 18:9	position 16:4	pressure 37:20
opinion 37:23	46:3	perspectives 2:12	28:3 38:5 43:11	prestigious 21:13
46:21	partially 2:19	persuading 46:8	positions 19:6	pretend 17:13
opponent 36:2	participate 25:4	Peter 2:14	possibility 27:6	pretty 4:7
opportunity	28:5 38:14	petrified 22:5	possible 43:4	prevail 13:12
12:15 36:19	participated	Pfizer 16:1	possibly 18:6	prevailing 5:17
42:19	47:22	phenomenal	22:5 34:9 42:20	25:15
oppose 4:16	participation	29:22	post-secondary	previous 8:21
optimism 21:7	28:24	philosophy 31:7	25:3 27:24	32:19 35:1
23:5 40:8,19,20	particular 8:18	phone 35:3	potential 23:5	Princeton 38:19
43:16	particularly	phonetic 44:22	potentially 11:24	38:20,21 42:7
optimistic 3:22	28:11 48:11	picture 18:11,24	12:15,16 18:13	42:25 43:1
3:23 22:17	parties 49:7	pin 16:18 17:1	pounding 37:22	principle 16:11
		 ^	1	<u> </u>
	*	-	-	-

	Ī	Ī	<u> </u>	
prior 39:20	32:7	racist 38:22 45:8	recommend	reporters 15:8
private 32:25	proxies 28:11,21	ran 9:19	12:15	Republican
34:4 41:15,25	public 19:23	rationalize 14:22	recording 2:1	39:21
probably 2:4	32:25 42:16	Rauh 39:25	35:3 48:13 49:4	require 28:3
24:9,9,10,12	published 7:3,4	42:24 47:25	recruit 11:5	required 19:23
29:11,11 31:3	24:6	re-create 44:8	reduced 24:17	requirement
32:20 33:22	pummel 7:14	reaccreditation	Reed 38:13,15,16	19:17 21:24
34:12 44:19	punish 14:15	34:1	39:5,8	28:13
problem 18:1	purge 19:9,25	reach 29:20	reestablish 47:3	requirements
30:23 42:9	20:4	reached 29:18,21	referred 40:12	20:24 27:4
problems 8:20	purpose 4:21	react 37:10	reform 8:22 18:9	requires 11:4
31:16 44:15	purposes 23:25	read 16:12,13	21:6 24:5 42:15	requiring 12:1
proceedings	35:3,4	29:11 30:1 41:6	reformers 21:12	research 6:20
26:13 49:4	purse 36:23,25	46:19	reforms 24:8	resources 22:21
process 26:12	37:5 40:22	reaffirm 6:17,22	regarding 26:17	respect 21:10
34:20,21 42:3	pursue 4:23	reaffirms 5:24	39:17	respond 4:10,11
produ- 32:21	push 16:9,9,14	real 21:5 44:11	regime 42:18	responds 4:9
professor 2:5	pushing 28:2	realistic 8:11	regional 27:8,12	responsibilities
18:5 20:5 26:25	34:23	10:10	33:21	39:4
43:10	put 17:16 19:16	reality 10:3,5	Registration	responsible 2:19
professors 32:17	26:17 31:20	really 3:8 9:15,15	49:17	rest 42:12 44:18
profit 9:9	36:11,15,19	23:6,14 30:14	regulation 41:8	retaliating 46:22
program 24:19	37:12 48:1	31:1,21 35:16	regulations 26:16	return 21:19
25:4 28:24	puts 25:8	39:23 40:2,5,15	40:24 41:13	reversing 3:12
programs 25:7	putting 37:20	41:1,4 45:7,10	regulatory 24:5	revisited 9:23
39:14,17	Q	45:12 46:6	reject 18:15	revolt 36:1,5
progress 21:2		47:21,22,24	related 11:23	revolution 35:17
prohibit 27:22	qualified 12:16	reaping 31:3	23:24 49:6	rewriting 42:15
prohibiting	queer 19:5	reason 6:10 10:3	relie- 25:13	rhetoric 30:4
40:23,25 41:5	question 9:23	14:5 18:16	relief 25:14,14	37:23
prohibits 25:5	16:19 24:21	21:21 22:7 24:2	religious 25:24	rhetorical 5:20
project 39:7	36:24 40:11,21	reasons 9:20 19:1	25:25 26:14	Richard 29:3
44:23	questions 6:21 9:22 40:7 45:15	28:1 45:7	27:19,19,21	38:13 43:13,22
promote 5:5		reassert 4:19	39:21,23	44:9 46:18
proof 4:25	47:15	reasserts 6:24	remember 30:3	47:25
protect 27:13,19	quickly 34:9	rebuild 20:17	removal 19:5	rid 10:2 37:2
41:17,21	quiet 46:21	rebuilt 23:14	remove 19:14,15	43:6
protections 26:11	quite 9:3	rebutted 6:16	19:21	ride 8:25
26:12	quonces 36:13	receive 11:4 25:5	Renaissance 18:6	Ridicule 16:14
provide 6:21	quote 6:17	recipients 37:16	repealed 2:20	right 2:8 3:19,21
26:11	R	37:17	replaced 18:12	4:3,5,6,14,20
provision 28:17	R 49:1	reciprocal 5:25	replicated 32:22	4:24 5:5,7,11
provisions 28:18	race 20:7 21:14	6:1	report 12:2	5:18,20 6:3,5,7
Provost 12:22	racism 5:6	recognize 7:18	reporter 15:21	6:8,10,11,13,19
provosts 31:18		15:9 33:3	49:2,16	7:4,8,11,14,17
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	

7.10.22.0.1.2.4	1.24.616	00.00.05.00.04	106 17	
7:19,23 8:1,2,4	rule 24:6,16	20:23 25:23,24	sexual 26:17	somebody 12:1,3
8:7,10,11,13	41:24	26:14 27:10,11	share 29:9	36:18
9:1,4,7,12,22	rules 5:9 8:8,9,12	27:19,19 36:9	shared 5:10,11	somebody's
9:23 10:8,11,12	27:18 40:12	37:1 38:10	shootings 7:2	10:18
10:15,17,20,24	run 9:6,6 21:14	scope 26:18	short-term 33:4	somewhat 24:17
11:14,18,22	22:13 42:9,10	Scott 2:23 29:5	Shorthand 49:2	soon 3:2 21:1
12:8,17,21,23	running 9:13	40:3 41:4,6	49:16	sophomores
13:8,13,15,17	21:8,9 34:4	scramble 38:12	shots 6:8	37:16
13:19 14:2,4,5	ruthless 10:6,8	scurry 34:14	shove 15:19	sore 29:4
14:7,11,13,14	<u> </u>	search 5:10,12	show 29:8	sort 4:25 5:13 9:1
14:17,19,25		6:1 17:5 33:16	shows 30:3	13:3 14:8 20:11
15:2,3,6,17,18	S&M 41:19	seat 29:14	shut 33:12	39:2,4,10 43:18
15:20,23 16:1,2	SACS 33:10	second 4:7 9:25	shutting 36:17	45:13,16,21
16:3,4,5,7,11	SACSSOC 33:21	26:3 40:21 44:2	sic 14:24 17:5	sorts 10:9 13:19
16:22 17:1,9,10	34:5	45:9 46:2	26:25 33:21	39:17
17:13,14,17,19	safe 30:9	secondly 45:20	37:3	soul 44:16
23:18 27:7 31:2	salary 22:13	secretaries 30:15	side 21:11 41:19	sound 19:24
39:1,16 40:16	Salem 47:18	secretary 24:3	45:17 47:10	sounds 41:6
41:13 42:10	Sarah 2:23	30:16 34:23	signing 38:24	sovereignty
43:3,9,21 44:1	Sasse 13:1	36:19	silver 35:16,17	27:14
44:4,6,9 45:5,6	satisfy 20:24	see 2:11 6:2 23:9	44:14	spaces 26:11
46:17,19,24	Saul 16:12,12,13	24:19,20 27:15	simply 10:3 25:2	speaker 6:9
47:7,8,9,10,11	16:14 21:7	34:13,25 35:10	41:25	15:17 18:3 23:3
47:12	46:19	36:5,6 38:11	single 15:20	23:10 30:12
rights 11:7 23:24	savvy 11:1	seed 32:20	22:22 33:25,25	45:1,2
36:1,3 39:12,22	saw 3:2 15:12,13	seek 25:13	sink 30:23 32:13	special 25:25
41:13,14	35:23	seen 3:4,5,5	Sinovac 15:15,19	26:11
rings 9:13,19	saying 7:6,17,18	14:23 23:17	15:22 16:2,3	specifically 21:14
Ro- 44:6	7:19 11:7 19:24	40:17	sit 20:2,7,9 21:25	specificity 17:3
road 27:2	29:6 34:12	seize 42:20	31:24	speech 2:20 4:17
Robbie 42:6 44:2	38:24 39:2 43:2	select 33:15	situation 19:25	4:17,24 5:12,19
44:3,5,6,9	46:23	self-interest 10:2	39:16	5:23,25 11:16
Robinson 2:14	says 8:7 16:6	selling 29:25	slate 17:7	11:24 12:1,2,4
Roland 7:2	31:20 33:8	sensibility 21:18	slickness 17:21	13:23 14:5,14
role 24:7,13	34:24	sensitive 35:15	smart 9:16 14:17	14:16 21:16
27:23 41:11	Scalia 2:5 11:8	serious 11:11	snail-pace 42:8	43:3
Ron 45:21,23	scenarios 7:25	47:10	socialist 41:18	speed 32:23
46:3,4,5,14,15	school 2:6 11:8	served 9:2	society 5:5,24	sponsoring 40:4
46:18	12:22,23 14:12	service 25:23	21:20 45:12	47:19
room 3:5 4:4 7:2	21:10 28:4	42:16	Solomon 11:2,9	sports 26:11
10:12 24:10	29:14 30:9	set 3:7 19:21,22	11:13,15 36:11	sta- 26:4
roughly 18:7	31:23 32:10	44:11	solution 31:4	stable 7:20
rounding 4:24	36:22 37:18,22	settle 15:21	solutions 24:1,1	stand 21:16
Rubinstein 38:14	47:18	settled 15:7	40:2,5	42:23
39:8	schools 11:6	sex 26:9,10	solve 44:14	standard 11:18
		20.2,10	20270 11111	200000000000000000000000000000000000000
	1	1	1	1

		I	I	I
39:3	straight 14:3	suppressed 6:18	22:17 30:18	14:20 15:8
standards 4:25	strategy 3:12,15	6:23,24	37:7	18:23,24,25
7:22 42:15	14:17,18 30:22	suppression 20:3	telling 5:22,22	26:8 29:9 30:4
Stanford 26:1	30:22 46:16,17	sure 12:5 21:3	temerity 9:16	31:10 34:8,24
30:5	streamed 46:11	37:24	ten 12:22 16:24	35:19 37:9,13
star 13:13	strep 29:5	surrender 15:6	38:3	37:19 41:1,6,9
start 2:3 3:10 4:5	stress 41:24	system 24:13	tenure 10:2 38:3	42:14 44:5 46:3
5:20 15:1 17:25	strictly 37:4	34:6 38:6	38:4,7	think 2:18 3:17
21:1 29:25 31:2	strong 19:16	system's 43:17	term 2:17	3:18,23 4:7 6:2
37:20	strongest 36:24	systemic 5:6	terms 6:16 10:13	6:11 7:16,23,24
started 29:10	strongly 40:16	systemically	39:11	8:1,18,21 9:25
42:4,6	structure 31:14	38:22	Terri 49:2,16	10:2,8,11,11,22
starts 37:22	student 27:23	systems 27:15	Texas 20:1,8 47:4	11:1,23 12:8,12
state 11:25 20:1,9	28:6 35:2		49:3,16,19	13:5,5,6,18
21:8 22:2 24:9	students 12:3	<u>T</u>	thank 17:23	14:7,20,24 18:5
27:15 29:13,15	14:1,2,16 16:21	T 49:1,1	23:16 29:3,10	18:7,14,19,23
30:8 32:14 33:9	19:2 20:12,24	table 3:7	30:10 39:25	20:5 24:16
36:3 42:6,24	32:22,24 33:1	take 15:19 19:17	45:2 47:15,17	25:17,18,25
43:22 49:3	37:14 38:3 42:5	22:2,13 24:24	47:23,24 48:3,9	30:22 31:14,18
state's 42:5	studies 23:22	26:4 28:3,9	48:12	33:5 34:8 35:11
statement 18:7	34:25	30:25	thanks 23:15	35:11,16,18,18
statements 9:10	study 7:2	taken 40:14 49:8	30:6 33:22	35:19,20,24
states 27:14	stuff 4:25 18:16	takes 24:10 43:16	38:13 39:25	36:6,8,12 37:8
29:12 32:23	19:6 20:13	talk 8:15 17:2	40:1 48:1	38:5,8 39:1
36:22 37:8	32:19 38:1	18:1 30:22 31:9	theorist 21:15	41:11,22 42:1,3
statute 25:12	style 21:7	talked 10:4,5	theory 7:12 11:20	42:4 43:12,16
26:6,14 41:8,15	sub- 2:15	11:25	14:7 19:5 20:7	43:22 45:5,6,7
statutes 43:5	subjected 32:19	talking 8:5 13:8	46:15	45:9,11,21,22
stay 16:10 24:17	subordinate 4:19	26:25 31:1	They'd 22:25	45:23,24,25
staying 40:5	4:20	Tallahassee	thi- 6:3	46:17 47:2,2,13
steal 12:10 43:24	success 32:2 44:3	30:14	thing 3:11,16 9:1	thinking 7:24
stellar 2:7	successful 44:7	tangled 17:4	9:25 10:19	10:9 13:19
step 22:11	sucker 46:16	tat 7:10,11,13,20	12:12 13:3,22	28:11
steps 24:25 26:4	sudden 14:13	7:22 10:5 46:16	16:16 19:4,15	thinks 3:14 45:18
28:9	32:24 42:17	46:23	20:14,19 22:19	third 12:12 20:14
stick 6:7	sue 25:13	taught 37:24,25	22:19 24:24	22:7 26:21
sticking 40:1	sued 2:24 13:15	teachers 29:18	26:3 30:24	thought 3:15
stop 14:21,21,22	29:16	35:20	34:18 37:10	29:5,7 36:2
19:13,19 43:5	sui 13:1	teaches 41:18	39:9 42:25 44:2	47:16
45:18	Suite 49:18	teaching 37:4	44:12 46:20	three 18:24,25
stopping 40:10	sunset 44:17	team 12:13,24	things 3:8 6:18	19:1 29:9 31:4
stops 40:11	support 11:8	13:4 24:4 32:17	8:5,7,23 9:24	33:18 38:3
stories 22:17	38:9 48:9,10	television 15:20	10:9 11:16,18	throat 29:4
story 15:7 29:25	supposed 45:4	tell 3:25 15:7	12:9,11 13:13	throw 21:15
44:3	suppress 6:15	16:21,24 17:7,9	13:20,20 14:8	30:23 32:13

thunder 12:10	treated 25:19	44:13	11:22 13:7,17	walking 30:8
tied 11:17	treating 25:18	understand 5:13	13:21 18:13	want 6:14 9:6
time 9:18 15:20	tried 3:22	7:12,12 22:4	39:3,22 40:22	15:22 17:10,15
16:2 18:14	trivial 5:1	32:4 46:15,15	45:13	23:4 29:10
22:22 23:6 29:2	true 6:21 7:6,6,7	understands 31:6	uses 35:3	31:21,22,23,24
29:19 34:23	42:19	46:16	usually 13:14	33:8 34:3,3
43:16 44:24	truly 27:7	unelected 22:1	usurp 32:5	35:10 42:24
times 30:2	Trump 29:20	unfactual 30:4	usui p 32.3	43:4 44:5 45:3
tiny 22:9	38:17,23	UNIDENTIFI	$\overline{\mathbf{V}}$	45:13 46:24,24
tit 7:10,11,12,20	trust 42:21	6:9 15:17 18:3	V-shaped 23:8	47:9,14,15,17
7:22 10:5 46:15	trustees 2:14,16	23:3,10 45:1,2	vacation 15:14	47:23,24 48:3
46:23	8:25 9:3,13	unintended 7:19	vaccination 2:25	48:10
Title 13:10,11	31:21,22	7:20,24 8:15,17	vaccine 15:10,11	wanted 17:11
24:6,19 25:4,11	truth 4:23 5:3,3	10:4 11:19	15:16 16:6 37:2	wants 16:20
25:11 26:5,6,9	5:11,12,13 6:1	36:13 41:17	vaccines 6:7	45:16
, ,	, ,		vehicle 4:18	
26:15,16,19	6:14,15,23	union 29:18	verbatim 30:1	Warren 8:4,6
27:23 28:5,23	42:23	univer- 4:21	verbatiii 30.1 vessels 45:13	wasn't 33:14,14
39:15 41:14,14	truths 6:16	universally 13:10	VI 25:11 39:15	Watson 41:3
today 7:3 8:21	try 3:25 18:2,9	13:12	41:14	waves 39:9
14:25 24:23	45:17 47:3	universities 1:8	victim 33:14	way 4:16 7:5 9:4
27:1 31:2	trying 5:12 13:4	2:3,20 3:13	video 35:4	11:17 14:6,6
Todd 2:4,7 18:1	14:21,21,22	5:10,11 11:4,10	video 33.4 videoed 46:10	22:13 25:1,8,19
23:5,16 44:12	19:13 40:2	11:13 13:14		25:21 28:25
told 4:10 17:6	Tuesday 19:19	19:7 20:16,18	view 4:13,21 5:13 5:14 6:22 9:4	29:17 44:20,21
tolerate 20:10	turn 8:16 14:1	20:23 23:17		ways 18:22 32:5
tools 3:9 13:7,17	17:23	26:24 28:1 29:1	24:10,12 43:9 43:11	36:12
13:22	turned 13:25	31:11 32:11	viewed 18:5	we'll 2:9,9,9 12:8
total 19:4	Turns 12:18	33:1,20 34:7		19:17 22:21
totally 45:8	TV 16:5	38:2,4 40:8	viewpoint 25:3,6	23:13 27:16
tough 2:10 9:15	Tweet 6:7	44:8	40:24,25 41:5 41:12	44:18
9:16 10:19	twelve 16:24	university 2:5,24		we're 2:8 6:12
toured 30:8	twice 25:18	4:22 5:2,4 8:21	views 3:22	7:10 8:1,11
trade 30:11	two 2:20 8:19	8:22 9:5,6,6	violation 11:7	10:13 17:13
tradition 18:15	31:9 32:1,8	11:12 16:4	violations 39:14	18:1 20:11 23:1
18:17	34:8 37:16 40:7	19:11,24 20:8	39:15,15,23	29:2 30:21 31:1
training 20:2,10	41:20 45:7,15	22:3,24 25:6	violence 5:19,23	32:23 33:2
trajectory 3:20	type 13:2 41:14	26:24 27:2,15	Virginia 35:25	34:24 35:11,11
transcription		31:15,22 32:9	virtuous 45:12	37:13 38:5
49:4,10	U	32:15 33:9,12	voice 21:19 29:6	39:16 40:2
transition 30:14	U.S 24:4,7,10	33:25 38:6	\mathbf{w}	47:13,13
transparency	ultimately 40:13	42:13 43:10	$\frac{\mathbf{w}}{\mathbf{w}\mathbf{a}-7:4}$	we've 10:23
34:10,19 35:12	unable 38:14	44:7		13:24 15:4
36:7	uncomfortable	unquote 6:17	wager 7:2	18:12,16,20,21
treading 22:5	17:19	upset 35:6	waiting 8:6	18:21 20:12
treat 21:23	undercurrent	use 7:16 11:1,9	walk 43:23 44:17	24:23 30:5,19
				l

	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	1	
32:9,11 33:3,5	39:21 46:11	young 16:22 21:7	5,000 32:24	
41:1 42:14	48:5	23:17 45:16,17	50 29:12 32:22,23	
weak 28:14	worked 24:5 39:6	48:11	42:5	
weapon 36:24	47:25	Youngkin 35:25	6	
weaponize 11:20	workforce 23:24	$\overline{\mathbf{z}}$		
weaponized 6:17	working 3:14,15		6581 49:16	
weapons 39:3	4:4 30:21 34:22	zero 12:18	67 36:22	
website 43:2	46:9	Zywicki 2:4,8	7	
weeks 36:6	works 11:10	6:10 15:18	741:14	
weigh 10:18	17:12 36:10	38:13 39:20	7-31-23 49:20	
weird 45:4	world 4:13,14 7:4	43:13,20 44:22	75206 49:19	
well-established	9:9 15:11	46:14 47:6	73200 49.19	
43:10	world's 18:6,8	0	8	
went 16:5 19:16	worried 41:24		855-5100 49:19	
31:23 32:10	worry 8:15	1		
33:19 48:5	worse 8:10 11:21	100 32:22 42:5	9	
whack-a-mole	15:1	101 49:18	90 22:10	
19:15	worst 7:25 28:15	10s 36:20		
whatsoever	worth 7:24 13:18	12 32:11 38:2		
47:21	36:21	15 2:12		
White 38:17	wouldn't 34:12	19 33:1 45:4 46:9		
wife 15:14 34:12	write 43:4	19-year-old 6:8		
William 8:23	write-in 2:13	1964 41:14		
willing 7:16 13:7	written 40:25			
13:17 31:7	41:9	2		
39:22 43:23	wrong 42:11	2 40:12		
win 44:17 45:17	X	20 31:3		
winning 46:17	A	20-year 31:1		
wins 22:23,24	Y	2019 7:4		
withstand 29:23	Yale 8:23 14:12	2020 24:7 26:17		
withstanding	Yale's 14:13	2025 27:6 39:11		
7:23	yeah 3:15 18:4	214 49:19		
witness 29:22	19:2 23:2,11	25 13:24 47:20		
witnesses 3:1	34:17,17 39:20	28 32:11 38:2		
women's 26:11	41:10 44:2,22			
won 13:11	46:3	3		
wondering 40:18	year 12:2 15:23	3 40:12		
41:7	32:21,22 38:24	312 49:17		
word 14:25 22:11	years 2:12,21	4		
45:8	11:6 13:24			
work 3:17,18,19	23:13 24:5 31:3	4228 49:18		
9:3 10:25 11:1	31:5,5 32:3	49 37:8 45:23		
11:10 19:17	35:1 37:15,16	46:3		
21:4,5 29:19	46:9	5		
31:25 32:1	10.5			
	l	1	l l	